DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 495 AC 012 503

TITLE	Higher Education Administrators' Institute for Teacher Training in Adult Basic Education Workshop.
INSTITUTION	Utah Univ., Salt Lake City. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	158p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; Administrator Responsibility; *Adult Basic Education; Adult Learning; Colleges; Discussion Groups; Higher Education; Institutes (Training Programs); Participant Involvement; *Professional Continuing Education; Program Planning; Regional Programs; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Universities; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Region IX; Region VI; Region VII; Region VIII

ABSTRACT

A workshop held December 7, 8, and 9, 1970, was the second phase of a three-part program which aims to organize and develop Adult Basic Education (ABE) teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education. The goals of the workshop were to: (1) inform participants about the need for professional preparation in teaching Adult Basic Education; (2) inform participants about research relevant to organizing teacher education programs; (3) help participants develop in-service training plans that they could use at their respective institutions; (4) help participants develop measurement and evaluation skills with which they could judge their own Adult Basic Education programs; and (5) provide a place for participants to exchange ideas, opinions and findings, and to develop specific plans of action to initiate at their institutions. The 32 participants in the workshop were from 26 institutions from 20 states west of the Mississippi River. The four papers presented at the workshop were: "A Report on Reaching the Undereducated in Salt Lake City" by Suzanne Weiss, "Report of the Southern Regional Education Board Project in Adult Learning" by Charles E. Kozoll, "Theories of Adult Learning for Teachers of Adults" by Howard Y. McClusky, and "Developing a Theory of Adult Teaching" by Jack Mezirow. Material discussed in Question and Answer Sessions is also presented. (For related document, see AC 012 505.) (DB)

ED 061495

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Workshop Proceedings

PARK CITY, UTAH
DECEMBER 7, 8, 9, 1970

Higher Education Administrators' Institute For Teacher Training In Adult Basic Education

AC012603

Graduate School of Education
University of Utah

REPORT:

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS' INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION WORKSHOP

December 7-9, 1970
Treasure Mountain Inn, Park City, Utah

Sponsored By The:
Higher Education Administrators' Institute
Graduate School of Education
University of Utah

Dr. Alton P. Hadlock, Institute Director
Dr. Charles F. Caskey, Institute Associate Director

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Higher Education Administrators' Institute
Rooms 138 and 140
Special Events Center
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION v

SUMMARY vii

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Introductions

C. H. Monson 3

S. P. Hencley 7

R. B. Minnis 9

"A Report on Reaching the Undereducated in Salt Lake City" (S. Weiss) 13

Question and Answer Session 17

"Report of the Southern Regional Education Board Project in Adult Learning" (C. E. Kozoll) 25

Question and Answer Session 32

"Theories of Adult Learning for Teachers of Adults" (H. Y. McClusky) 45

Question and Answer Session 57

Question and Answer Session (P. V. Delker) 69

"Developing a Theory of Adult Teaching" (J. Mezirow). . 79

Question and Answer Session 86

Back Home Plans 107

APPENDIXES

Workshop Agenda 133

Workshop Goals 135

"Adventure and the Emerging Roles of the Adult Education Leader" (H. Y. McClusky) 137

Staff of the Institute 147

Members of the Advisory Committee 147

Workshop Participants 148

U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. Office . . 151

U. S. Office of Education Regional Program Officers . . 152

State Directors of Adult Education 153

INTRODUCTION

The Park City Workshop, from which the contents of this publication derive, was the second phase of a three-part program whose overall aim is to organize and develop Adult Basic Education (ABE) teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education.

The Workshop followed a Planning and Commitment Phase, in which an Advisory Committee was formed to help plan the program of the Institute. Also during this phase, institutions with serious interest in initiating or expanding adult teacher education programs were identified and contacted regarding participation in the Workshop. The third or post-Workshop phase of the Institute is a Consultation Phase, in which institutions which participated in the Workshop will implement programs in teacher preparation for Adult Basic Education. In this phase, the participants will call upon experts in the field of Adult Education to consult with and help them organize and establish programs.

Twenty-six institutions from twenty states west of the Mississippi River sent thirty-two participants to the Workshop. Participants were selected by application and screening according to the following criteria:

1) The institution is a higher education institution within the state and has a teacher training component which can provide certification.
2) The institution either does not have an adult teacher education curriculum, or it wants to expand its present program.
3) The institution indicates a desire and commitment to initiate or expand Adult Basic Education teacher education activities.
4) The institution indicates that it will cooperate with the State Director of Adult Education of the State Department of Education within the state in organizing a teacher education curriculum.
5) The participant is an administrator of a teacher education program in a college or university.
6) The participant is authorized to organize and administer classes for credit at that institution.
7) Participants need not have experience in preparing professional personnel for their roles and responsibilities in Adult Basic Education.

The goals of the Workshop followed from the primary concern by the Institute that leaders, deans and chairmen of teacher education departments be provided with the knowledge and skills necessary to organize, conduct and expand programs for teacher education in Adult Basic Education. More specifically, the goals of the Workshop were:

1) To inform participants about the need for professional preparation in teaching Adult Basic Education.
2) To inform participants about research relevant to organizing teacher education programs.
3) To help participants develop in-service training plans which they could use back home.
4) To help participants develop measurement and evaluation skills with which they could judge their own Adult Basic Education programs.
5) To provide a gathering place for participants to exchange ideas, opinions and findings, and to develop specific plans of action which they could initiate back home.

Although only three months have passed since the Workshop, participating institutions have been very active in working toward the goals of the Institute. As of March 12, 1971, twenty-four institutions had utilized or requested consultant services or had made progress toward in-service training programs.** Consequently, an urgent need has been demonstrated in the area of teacher preparation for adult education. But the movement to develop such programs is just beginning and any definitive statement of results would be premature. Given the lead time necessary to establish a new program at any institution of higher education, it may be two years or more before the Institute's goals can be achieved. In the meantime, there will be a continuing need for a staff to encourage and help coordinate the development of programs in teacher preparation for Adult Basic Education, to keep communication going, and to provide services such as workshops and consultants. This Institute has made a determined start at doing those things.

** Five other institutions not funded by this Institute have entered into consortiums with members of this project. Eastern Montana College, Northern Montana College and Western Montana College have joined with the Institute member from Montana State University. Institutions from the states of Alaska and Oregon have joined with Washington State University.

SUMMARY

The Higher Education Administrators' Institute was held December 7-9, 1970 at the Treasure Mountain Inn in Park City, Utah. Thirty-two delegates and eight speakers met to exchange information which could help the delegates in establishing or expanding programs in teacher preparation for adult education at their respective institutions.

Monday

The Workshop opened with a session entitled "Goal Formation," led by Dr. Shizuko Harry, Associate Professor of Education at the University of Utah. This session served the dual functions of giving the participants a chance to get acquainted and of challenging them to search out what they hoped to gain through the Workshop. To these ends, participants separated into six work groups, and each group delineated several goals which it felt should be worked toward during and after the Workshop. Those goals are shown in the Appendix to this Report.

The Goal Formation session was followed by Introductions and Orientation. In their opening remarks, both Dr. Charles H. Monson, Associate Academic Vice President of the University of Utah, and Dr. Stephen P. Hencley, Dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Utah, stressed the important role the administrator can and should play in changing institutions to meet changing needs and in helping to open up opportunities for minorities. Dr. Alton Hadlock, Director of Adult Education at the University of Utah, then briefed participants on the background and goals of the Workshop and the Higher Education Administrators' Institute. Dr. Roy Minnis, Adult Education Regional Program Officer, U. S. Office of Education, ended the Introductions by summarizing the "state of the art" in teacher education for adult learning. He noted that there is not much professional training available in the Rocky Mountain area for adult and continuing education teachers, even though there is a great need for such professionalization. He did add, however, that some efforts have been made to develop professional programs, and he challenged Workshop participants to follow through from those beginnings.

After the Introductions and Orientation, Mrs. Suzanne Weiss, an Adult Education planner with the Salt Lake Guadalupe Center, spoke to participants on reaching the undereducated in Salt Lake City, Utah. According to Mrs. Weiss, only a small number of the undereducated in the Salt Lake Valley are being reached by educational programs. She thinks this is because administrators and teachers are not setting realistic goals for the undereducated. In working with Mexican-Americans in Salt Lake, Mrs. Weiss and co-workers have found that the traditional approaches to teaching and evaluating students are irrelevant to the needs of the undereducated and in fact may do more damage than good. As a result of these findings, a new education program was started whose goals and strategies are based on the backgrounds and needs of the undereducated and not on some pre-set curriculum. Techniques used include individualizing programs of learning, tutoring on a one-to-one basis, and building self-confidence in the students. Tests are not included. Recruiting for the program is being done in a target area, with one person informing and signing up everyone he can, and another person going back to find out who did not sign up and why, in an attempt to find out how the nonparticipants can be reached. Mrs. Weiss concluded by mentioning a Salt Lake adult education-employment program called JOBS, and she stressed that a job by itself would not necessarily help a disadvantaged person unless there were other supportive services like counseling and education which he could draw upon to help him through the first phases of what could be a new and very different lifestyle.

On Monday afternoon, Dr. Charles Kozoll, Associate Project Director of the Southern Regional Education Board, gave an address entitled, "A Report of the Southern Regional Education Board Project in Adult Learning." Kozoll's presentation was a case history on the development, progress and problems of the SREB Project, a cooperative effort of eight states in the Southeast to expand training programs for teachers in adult education. Kozoll emphasized the importance of the regional focus of the project in avoiding duplication of effort, encouraging wider and better organized participation in program development, and in facilitating communication among the institutions and state agencies involved in teacher preparation for adult education programs. Kozoll described the great expansion which has taken place in numbers and kinds of seminars, workshops, and graduate-undergraduate courses and degrees in adult education, but cautioned that much remains to be done in the areas of program planning, definition of roles/responsibilities, and region/state/institution cooperation, to insure that the SREB Project is not just a passing funded fancy.

In the evening session, Dr. Shizuko Harry and Dr. Alton Hadlock led participants in a group simulation exercise called the Prisoner's Dilemma. This exercise is an experiment involving communication, trust and mutal support in a situation where each of two groups tries to gain as many points as possible but where the number of points each group gets is determined by the choices of both groups.

After playing the game for a while, participants held a discussion to analyze what had gone on during the game.

Tuesday

Dr. Howard McClusky, Professor Emeritus at the University of Michigan, opened the morning session with, "Theories of Adult Learning for Teachers of Adults." He too emphasized how prevalent change has become in this society, how imperative continual learning has become as a result, and what a frontier there is for institutions to develop programs of adult education. To develop such programs, however, one thing institutions must understand is their adult client. To aid in such understanding, Dr. McClusky then devoted the rest of his speech to a discussion of the adult client, or, more specifically, to questions regarding the potential for and the process of adult learning. He reviewed at length the empirical and theoretical evidence regarding the adult's learning ability and concluded that based on evidence to date, adults can learn even as they get older but have not developed this potential to any extent because they see themselves as "workers" and not as "learners," and because they tend to be maintenance- rather than discovery-oriented. Dr. McClusky believes that such perceptions and habits are changing and can be changed even more.

Concerning the adult learning process, Dr. McClusky discarded the classic S-R model as too simple to apply to human learning, for it underemphasizes or ignores the person. It would be more accurate to think in terms of a more complicated model such as an S-O-R model, where "O" stands for the individual who, as the intervening variable in the process, brings his own wants, needs and dispositions into the picture to select, organize and act on stimuli in his own particular way. Dr. McClusky concluded that the importance of this model for the teacher is that he must know something about his students (and vice versa) as individuals and must be highly attuned to feedback from them to determine what they are responding to in what manner.

Mr. Paul Delker, Director of the Division of Adult Education, U. S. Office of Education, then joined the participants and in place of a formal presentation, he held a Question-Answer Session. He discussed questions regarding the status of federal funding for adult education and the future challenges and problems in adult education. He also described the new Adult Performance Level project which was to begin in early 1971. This project will try to find out what an adult needs to know in the way of reading, writing, computation and general information to get along in this society---to derive an empirical definition of functional illiteracy which ABE programs can take as their starting point.

On Tuesday afternoon, Dr. Jack Mezirow, Associate Professor of Adult Education at Columbia University Teachers College, spoke to the participants on, "Developing a Theory of Adult Teaching." He described a research project he is doing at Columbia Teachers College which aims at providing planners with an in-depth view of what is actually going on in ABE classrooms, in order that they might have a better idea of where the problems are and what directions planning should take in ABE programs.

Using the techniques of participant observation, informal interviewing, and panel analysis, research teams in six cities studied ABE programs multidimensionally from the standpoints of organization and structural dynamics; classroom interaction; and teacher/student attitudes, perceptions and motivations regarding their ABE experiences. Some of the findings after one year of study were that: (1) English as a Second Language (ESL) was replacing ABE for many native born adults; (2) job aspiration patterns of ABE students differ from those described in the sociological literature, and (3) enrollment in and attendance at ABE classes have a pronounced influence on teacher attitude, classroom atmosphere, and whether or not a program will be continued, even though it is not clear if or how they are related to program success. Mezirow concluded by saying that the research project will be continued for another year, during which time four field experiments and a series of regional workshops will be conducted.

Wednesday

Participants spent the day preparing plans of action which they would follow to establish programs in teacher preparation for adult education at their own institutions. These plans and their subsequent implementation represented the most crucial outcome of the Workshop, for they embody the goals of the Higher Education Administrators' Institute. The success or failure of the Institute would be determined in the following months and years by the degree to which participants' plans were carried out.

These action plans were presented at the last session of the Workshop and are included in the Appendix of this Report as Back Home Plans.

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Dr. Charles H. Monson, Jr.
Associate Academic Vice President
University of Utah

It is my pleasure to do what every conference has to have done, in welcoming you to the University of Utah and to this center where we hold many of our conferences.

May I say just a few things about what you are doing here. I am a philosopher by background and by inclination, and I sometimes make the mistake of thinking about what I do in my administrative work. I have spent a lot of time working with dissident students and with minority groups; I got involved with the Women's Lib group last year, and I have come to the conclusion that we live in a world that is filled with minorities. I doubt whether there are majorities anywhere. You know, people feel their color makes them a minority, or their culture, their economic circumstances, or their sex does. You are working with adults, and I have no doubt that lots of adults think of themselves as minorities. I don't know if you ever think of them that way, but I think all minorities have some characteristics in common. They have a lot of things that are different, but a lot of things in common also. One of them is a lack of self-confidence in their ability to deal with the world in which they live. I spent a couple of hours yesterday with the black students union, and I listened to the problems they see in trying to develop leadership in their own group.

How do you develop a sense of self-confidence? How do you help people who are working on basic adult education to get a sense of self-confidence so that they can develop their own talents? One of the problems is to develop the skills for dealing with the institution. There is just no doubt in my mind that it takes a lot

---

Charles H. Monson, Ph.D., Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, is currently the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Professor of Philosophy and Professor of the Philosophy of Education at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City. He is also a consultant to the USOE and WICHE. He has received grants for a teaching assistant training program and a pre-college program for Mexican-American and Indian students. He has published many books and articles in philosophy and education.

of skill to operate effectively in the University and to operate effectively in a classroom. Unless people have those skills, they are scared to death of getting involved, and they will walk into it as though you are going into a cold stream -- just trying a little bit at a time until you get enough confidence to handle yourself. There are financial problems that minorities experience. Is it worthwhile in putting time, energy, and money into this rather than into something else? It seems to me that all of these sorts of problems that deal with self confidence, skills, financial support, and psychological support, are characteristics that every group will have.

I think every group does have the problems of a minority in one way or another. I've also come to the conclusion that the problem of minority education is not the minority's problem. I don't think the problem of women's liberation is the Women's Lib problem. It seems to me that it is our problem -- that it is the problem of those who have some control over the institutions of this society. It's our problem because we are the ones that can do something about it. I'm convinced that the people who are going to make a difference in this society are the people who are in the positions of responsibility to the society, not the people who are out of it -- those making the noise and protesting. If this conclusion which I have come to as a result of a fair amount of involvement in over about four or five years is right, it means we have to develop the skills that will help them to get self-confidence and learn how to find the psychological and academic support they need.

The initial job, then, in education is not developing a curriculum or developing teachers. It is getting ourselves ready to know how to do it. I discovered when I first started working with minority groups about three years ago that I didn't know how to work effectively with them. I had to learn enough myself so that they had confidence in me. Then I could begin to work with them and, knowing the system that I work in, maybe I could begin to work effectively.

I find it interesting that in your group here, there are no minorities that I can see -- at least no obvious ones except two ladies who are helping to get the conference organized and keep it functioning well. How much do you have to do with the kind of people you are trying to instruct? How often do you meet with them? How much do you know about their problems and their way of looking at the world? Their way is very different than most of ours. How much do you know about how they can relate to the system that we have? How much do we adjust our system in order to give them the skills, the self-confidence and other things they need in order to succeed in the system?

I think the learning process that goes on here is our learning process. I think we're the ones who must learn how to do the job, and that requires us to learn a good deal about them: what they think, what they value, how they look at the world, what scares them, and what interests them. Once we learn about these sorts of things, we can work effectively. All this implies that we are educable. It's a scary assumption sometimes that it is possible to get away from behind our desks and stop the problem of adjudicating disputes, trying to find where our boundaries go, worrying about budgets, and all things that administrators can do. It implies that we have to learn some things about ourselves and about other people with whom we are going to work. It means we need to get out!

A bit of counsel I want to leave with you out of my own experience is that you will do a certain amount of good here in talking with each other about the problems. But I think that the greatest amount of learning will occur when you make yourself a minority of one to meet with a group of people who need basic adult education. Then you'll learn something about yourself and something about what it takes to make them a part of the learning process, which is what we want to do.

I hope your conference will be a successful one. I'm sorry I can't spend more time with you in learning something about your thinking, because this is one kind of minority that I don't know very much about. I hope that as time goes by, Alton will keep me advised as to what you learn about the problem.

Dr. Stephen P. Hencley
Dean of the Graduate School of Education
University of Utah

It is indeed a great pleasure for me to welcome my counterparts to an occasion like this and to almost a half nation's consideration of problems that are national in scope. I understand that your group is selected from West of the Mississippi, so we have some kind of geographical affinity, as well as the fact that we are interested in problems of great national import.

I would like to bring you greetings from the Acting Commissioner of the U. S. Office of Education. Ted Bell regrets that he is not able to be with us. He did call, however, to tell me that his best wishes go with you for a successful conclusion of the kind of agenda that you are undertaking. Could he have been here, and had his duties not been so pressing at this time, he would have been delighted to spend these days with you and his many friends in the Salt Lake Valley. You know, therefore, that you have the good wishes of the Acting Commissioner, and he wanted me to be sure that I relayed them to you.

Secondly, of course, I would like to welcome you on behalf of the Graduate School of Education and the University of Utah. If any of you have a chance to drop by our shop, I hope that you will do so. It would be a marvelous opportunity for us to show you some of the things that we have at our university, because I have visited with many of you on your university campuses, and I have appreciated that opportunity very much.

I don't think I need to add very much to what Charles has already mentioned about the significance of this kind of gathering to those who will have a great deal of academic and administrative responsibility for intervening in the social and occupational

---

Stephen P. Hencley, Ph.D., University of Chicago, is presently Dean of the Graduate School of Education, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. He also serves on the Executive Panel of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, is Chairman of the University Council on Teacher Education at the University, and is State Liaison Representative to AACTE. He has been active in several large-scale research projects and has published extensively in the area of educational administration.

life-styles of a great many individuals on the national scene. I think that we have all had a great deal said to us about the way in which occupational life-styles are changing, and the need not only to develop the kinds of skills that will permit a person to enter into a vocation that is productive for him as an adult, but also to look forward to the possibility that it may be necessary to retrain himself successively as the country advances technologically and otherwise.

I see still another dimension. Through the efforts of groups such as this one, a number of occupations are opening up to minority and other groups who have not aspired to vocations of different kinds. As much as I would like to see the training and the retraining pushed, I would also like to see us be a vanguard kind of group that opens up the vocational and employment opportunity in a number of fields to which minorities have not aspired in any significant fashion in the past. It seems to me that at the University level, and most of us are at that level, we have an opportunity to do just that, and to open up new doors of opportunity for the people about whom we are talking in a way that has not been done previously.

Charles Monson and I were just discussing that as the minorities see new opportunities unfolding to them in the occupational structure of the world, they often turn to a number of fields in succession, and one of the very first perceived as being viable is the social service occupation that you would find in teaching and in education. Usually, they turn to us, they turn to nursing and they turn to social work first. Next they turn to business, then to the social and behavioral sciences, and finally to the hard sciences. So, if we are going to nurture and push this kind of thing, it seems to me that we should be on the vanguard in opening up that forward looking opportunity to great numbers of people within our own nation and elsewhere.

Once again, I wish you every success in this conference and welcome you on behalf of the Graduate School of Education and the University of Utah.

Dr. Roy B. Minnis
Adult Education Program Officer
U. S. Office of Education

I would like to do two things very briefly: one, give you a scent of what has happened before in relation to what we hope is happening here in these three days and will happen on your campuses when you go back; and two, give you a little challenge.

Adult and continuing education, and you will note that I did not say adult basic education, is to me the most rapidly growing field of education, and probably the least developed at this point in time in the whole United States---the least developed as far as becoming a professionalized part of education, and it has had some funny beginnings. We have approximately 30 universities in the United States that are offering graduate programs up through the doctoral level and, of course, a good many others that have graduate courses and in a few cases undergraduate courses. This is a field that started from the top down, as some did, rather than building on an undergraduate program. Throughout this central part of the United States and in the Rocky Mountain area, there is not much of this professionalization available. Most of the people that have gone through these 30 programs have accepted positions at rather advanced administrative or professional levels, so they do not affect directly the people that Vice President Monson was talking about---the undereducated disadvantaged minority groups. One of the objectives I perceive, then, is a type of professionalization of the first line persons, the persons that have direct contacts, the ones that in education we call "instructional personnel." We have little or no professional sequences of training at this point in time. Now, I would not as a professional person have criticism of the issue of learning by doing. It is an honored process in life. But it is slow, it is laborious, and it is expensive to become a professional in that manner. Usually, those

---

Roy B. Minnis, Ph.D., University of Iowa, Iowa City, did both his master's and doctorate work in adult education, and is currently an Adult Education Regional Program Officer in the U. S. Office of Education, Denver, Colorado. He has served as a local, university, state and federal administrator and substantive specialist; has organized the HEW Adult Basic Education Program from the USOE, Washington, D. C.; and has served as a USOE, AID, and United Nations consultant for adult education.

who advocate it as the answer to such problems do so because they learned by doing rather than engaging in a learning process with other persons and passing down that knowledge.

There have been a number of things which I think have direct relevance to what you are engaging in at this 3-day orientation. There have been visits by professional people to almost every one of the state institutions and a few of the private institutions in this region concerning the development of professional training sequences in adult and continuing education. In some parts of the United States, I know, this has not happened. Many of these visits were supported by a U. S. Office of Education funded project at the University of Colorado, if the name Vince Amanna means something to some of you, because he made a good many of these contacts.

Another important development in this professionalization occurred during the summer of 1968. Here again, there was funded through the University of Colorado, a teacher-training contract in the field of adult education, specifically adult basic, although not limited to that. As part of the activity, another institute for faculty members of colleges and universities in this region was suggested.

From our viewpoint, we would say that if a university is going to do a job, it has to have the competence to do it. With the specificity perceived in ABE, there were not many universities that had this competence, which is not to say that the universities did not realize this. We did have a cadre of faculty members from these institutions that got some orientation, worked with the teachers themselves in a skill training sequence and during the last two days finalized an in-service training program for their own states working together. In most cases, they carried these programs out after they got home. What I am saying is that in relation to some of you from five states in old Region VIII, there is some background that you and deans and administrators can build from.

A year ago last summer, the University of Utah tried another type of activity, supposedly to secure commitments from the institution in advance and to invite associate and full professors to develop additional understandings, relationships, and program designs as far as the field was concerned. This workshop, completed at the University of Utah a year ago last summer, was funded from the contract at the University of Colorado and was one of a number of workshops that summer.

For the deans and department chairmen who are here from those states involved, these associate and full professors were supposed to go back and do two kinds of things: first, they were to ascertain what could happen on their campuses as far as providing a long-range professional sequence of training; and second, they were to see what they could do to develop in-service experiences of a sequential nature for the people who were right out there on the firing line working with undereducated and illiterate persons. In addition, they had the privilege of developing a series of courses of study---syllabi, if you will---for those institutions that did not think they had the competence in their institutional faculty and did not have extra slots. They called it the "Heuristics" of adult education, and there were six such syllabi developed, not as mandates to any faculty member, dean or curriculum committee, but as ideas from which you could start if you did not have those people on your own campuses. Let me just read the titles: Adult Teaching and Learning, Methods and Materials in Adult Education, Sociology of Impoverished Life Styles, Psychological Implications of Deprivation on Adult Learners, Evaluation in Adult Education, and Seminar. These are available for you if you choose to use them.

We hope that during and after this workshop, there will be enough resource, enough concern, enough interest so that what happens as professional people work with the undereducated is truly professional in nature. The long-range potential is what happens on your campuses for both full- and part-time students---not necessarily just young people, but retarded people or persons who want to get elementary and secondary school educations, only to find there are no longer the multitude of positions available. They can be utilized and find a more exciting experience in another field of education they did not know existed because they had not had contact with it before.

Some people wonder what the clientele is. I have heard deans tell me this, and it used to bother me. "You provide me the clientele, you provide me the number of full-time positions, and we'll train the people." I think we expect today much greater leadership from our colleges and universities. Remember, we are talking about the number of people that have no place to prove their talents because society has changed so rapidly. There are about 20 million people in the U. S., according to our census, with less than an 8th grade education, and there are roughly 60 million with less than a secondary education. These are the kinds of clients for whom we are trying to provide educational leadership. It is quite a challenge.

As far as I am concerned, we in the regional office are willing to help you as much as possible to accomplish such an objective, but we can't do it alone. We don't have those direct contacts. We shouldn't be in the business of direct training. That is your role. Give us a chance to help. That is why we are here. Thank you.

Mrs. Suzanne Weiss
Guadalupe Center

Let me give you an idea of what is going on in Salt Lake and what programs are operating here. We have four community schools, and Model Cities Program has promised money for five more. We also have three Vista programs, an adult high school, a Work Incentive (WIN) program, and our Voluntary Improvement Program (VIP). At any one time there are no more than 600 people actively involved in these programs, and when I say "actively" I mean people who really attend. For example, we may report 100 students per quarter attending our classes, but of those, only 42 to 45 come every time and are actively involved. In Salt Lake Valley during 1960, according to the Census, there were 20,000 adults who needed educational services. Yet, we are reaching only around 600. In one area a statistical count indicated that six percent of the people were undereducated. After giving them a test, the results showed that 50 percent were functionally illiterate. So, it is difficult to determine the real size of the problem.

Our answer to why so few people are coming to these programs is that administrators and teachers are setting unrealistic goals which are not meeting the needs of the undereducated adult. Let me illustrate this by giving you a little insight and background into our Voluntary Improvement Program.

We view it as a step before the community school. We try to reach the isolated poor. All of our staff, except for our recruiters, are volunteers. Our students range from illiterate in two languages to college graduates that are learning English as a second language. Our coordinator is a Mexican American educator who has volunteered for a year and a half. He can communicate both with the lower class and the middle class, which is an outstanding quality. One recruiter is a Mexican American woman who has been on welfare for seven years. She relates very well with the poor. She is looked upon as a leader--

---

Suzanne Weiss, B.A., University of Utah, Salt Lake City, taught elementary school in Salt Lake for two years and worked as a volunteer coordinator of adult education programs before taking on a full-time position with the Guadalupe Center where she develops adult education programs. She is also Chairman of the Subcommittee for Community Involvement on the Title I Advisory Board and is active on the CORE Committee for Mexican-American Education, the Socio-Education Committee and the Model Cities Education Task Force.

someone who can communicate with the poor, and this is extremely important. Our other recruiter is an ex-Peace Corps volunteer, and he is also bilingual.

Regarding our background, let me say first of all that the program didn't evolve in an institution with lots of red tape and bureaucracy. It is a very flexible program. Five years ago, 35 Mexican families under the leadership of Father Gerald Merrill put their money together in an effort to help Mexicans help themselves. They noticed that Mexicans didn't have any place to go for fun. They didn't have money to go to the nice places, and the cheap bars really aren't much fun. So they rented an old warehouse in the middle of West Salt Lake and named it the Guadalupe Center. They decided to keep the place open all the time, and opened a little Mexican cafe. Much to our surprise, it boomed; and we now have enough money to start and keep several different projects going all the time. One of our employees recently described it as a "project development center." This is because after we opened, the needs of Mexicans became apparent. They had clothing problems, money problems, and food problems. They couldn't get jobs, and their children were delinquent and dropping out of school. Consequently, the Project developed a credit union, a food cooperative, a clothing store, a low cost housing project, a ranch for delinquent boys, a migrant council, a youth center, an adult education program, and just this year an early learning center for 4 to 6 year old children.

The need for an education program was obvious. The typical Mexican who comes to us has a language barrier and very often no language at all. He has a mixture of Spanish and English, with competency in neither. Very often he is either struggling on welfare or with a menial job at below-average wages, and he can't read well enough to handle his own affairs. To get a program started, we recruited some volunteer tutors from the middle class community. After a while, Community Action came along and offered to give us money if we would expand our program.

We started where we were with what we knew about education, and may I say that in the last few years I am the most successful student we have ever had. The first night we had 90 students, and we sat them all in our long dance hall. I used a microphone to administer a reading test and a basic math test. Then we sent the students home. We graded the tests and grouped the students by twos and threes. Soon the tutors started complaining that each student had a different learning rate, a different goal, and a unique background. Six months later we administered another reading test and found that instead of progress, in many cases there was regression. We began searching for materials, evaluation techniques, and ways to train tutors to teach. We looked at the situation in terms of the total community, then nationally, and were overwhelmed by the problems of the students along with the lack of materials and evaluation techniques, and the goals that educators set for us. The goals were and still are in terms of grade level or job placement; and there are many needs to which neither of these goals is relevant. How do you evaluate a nineteen year-old girl who can't read anything except her first name? She can't tell what time it is, she doesn't know the days of the week, and she doesn't know how to tell you to get to her house. We have even tried non-verbal tests, and they don't work. The first question that most educators would ask us is, "How many grade levels did you raise this girl?" A year later, all we could say is, "I don't think we took her up any grade levels. But she has a job in our cafe, and she comes to work on time. So I think she has learned something about time, and she can read all the labels on the beer cans, so we feel she has learned something." Is that success or not? How do you evaluate a 60 year-old woman who has gone through all the pain of raising 13 children on welfare? I would guess that woman knows a lot more than you or I about survival -- and about suffering. What are we supposed to teach her? If we follow the advice of educators so that we can measure her on grade levels, we will teach her a basic elementary school curriculum. Is that what she needs? Will that make any difference in her life? Will it make going to the store or communicating with her friends easier? We don't think so. Our attempts in adult education can be equated with attempts to educate children in inner city schools who, by the way, are the children of adults about whom we are talking. We have bent and twisted in every conceivable way programs that were developed for middle class children. We have yet to identify the needs of these children and train teachers to meet those needs. Most educators agree that standardized tests are the main cause for inflexibility that exists in educational institutions. Asking us to do these same things will only perpetuate failure for the lower socioeconomic adult.

As our program stands now, we hold classes twice a week for two-hour sessions. Our students meet informally in a large hall on a one-to-one basis, with volunteer tutors. The tutors come from the middle class community, but most of them do not have training in education. When a student comes to us, we try to identify what is important to him and, ideally, the tutor and student together build a program that will begin to meet the student's needs. We don't use tests any more. We use what the student says. One of our major weaknesses is lack of time. You can't accomplish much in four hours a week. We would like to have ten hours. But if we started a program that ran five nights a week, how could we get an adequate number of volunteers on a regular basis? Our tutors have to be definitely committed for a certain length of time. Another difficulty is getting a tutor to volunteer more of his time so we can train him. If we had a corps of competent teachers trained in adult education who could come out as a group and help us train these tutors, I think we would have a lot more success. If the tutors knew that more help was available, we could probably get more of them. One of the difficulties is convincing them that they can do the job. Our third problem as I have already mentioned is evaluating the students, the teachers, and the program. Evaluation should not be in terms of what we think we already know about education and its goals. It has to be in terms of realistic goals to meet real problems, and this is where we feel that education has failed. The research that has been done is extremely limited. It is a wide-open field, and I believe that if we find out how to reach the poor adult, we are going to find out how to reach the poor child. A good place to begin is to identify "needs" the way poor people see them rather than the way we see them. What are the problems of the poor, and how do we find out? This brings us to our fourth problem -- reaching the isolated poor: those who won't respond, and those who say, "I'm too old." "I'm too stupid." "If you are doing this, what are you getting out of it?" "Nobody would do anything for me." These are the ones who are so overcome by poverty that they don't care anymore. They have lost hope.

You might ask, "Why should we help them? Why should we even try to reach them? If they don't want our help, why should we give it to them?" We don't feel that we are giving them anything. We are simply opening doors that they couldn't open for themselves, and it might be our fault as educators. Furthermore, their children are dropping out of school. They are the ones that educators can't reach.

The following is an approach we plan to take, and it revolves primarily around the staff. You see, I don't relate very well to the poor. I get along with a lot of them, but I can't get into their homes because they don't trust me: I'm a middle class Anglo and my skin is too white.

We have never had a situation where people came in and applied for jobs. We found people, and we located the funds and hired them. A year ago we hired Richard Becker, a Peace Corps volunteer, to be our top recruiter. He really knows how to go into a neighborhood and organize the people. Then we hired Dorothy Gurule who had worked for the School Board four years, and she became our ground-floor recruiter. These people will be instrumental in reaching those who are difficult to recruit. We have selected a target area in a poor section in downtown Salt Lake. First, Richard will recruit everyone he can for whatever program they wish to join. Then, Dorothy will go in with an aid and identify every person that wouldn't go. They will find out why, what was wrong, and how we can reach them. After resolving this third problem, we will pull people into the neighborhoods instead of out of them. We know, for instance, that most of the men in lower socioeconomic sections have to fix their own cars and, with a mechanic, we will begin teaching each one how to fix it in better and cheaper ways. By this means they will begin to interact with people and see themselves in a different role -- as responsible citizens. If we find after identifying the needs and evaluating our progress that we are not meeting the goal, then we will either have to revise our program, or identify other goals.

A second adult education program through the National Alliance of Businessmen we call the JOBS program. One company in Salt Lake contracted with us for 160 hours of basic education extending over a 16-week period. We know that if you give a man a job you haven't necessarily solved his problems. So we are conducting this program for 13 men, ranging from illiterate to a tenth grade level. At the end of 16 weeks, we still have 100 percent holding power. We didn't make any records at the academic level, but we accomplished a lot in attitude change. When a man had problems at home and was ready to quit his job, we were right there to grab him and say, "No, you're not. We can work on it, you don't have to quit." One man had a check garnisheed, and all he could think of was quitting his job so they couldn't take all his money. We worked with him and we worked with his creditors. Now this man,who was given up by welfare as a lost cause, is holding a job. This is the kind of supportive service I am talking about. In developing a program, you should look at the total needs of the people you are serving and not assume that it is all academic, because it isn't. There are many of the poor we haven't even begun to touch, and I think a lot of responsibility lies with educators who say, "Everybody needs to read." We agree, but what do you have to do before you are able to read? This is where educators need to do more with the poor themselves.

We started a second program with five men, including one who has never worked before in his life. He has three children, is married, and is living with a father who has never worked. We will run the program for only 13 weeks, and we will take the additional 30 hours for individual counseling to make up for a deficiency that became apparent in our last attempt.

Question:

Would you list some of the competencies you think adult education teachers should have.

Response:

I would say, first of all, personality characteristics. A person must be able to listen to what a man is really saying, and not interpret for him. Secondly, a person must be able to communicate and empathize and value that adult as an equal.

Question:

How do we identify this teacher? How do we find and train him?

Response:

We encounter this when people come to volunteer. We interview a lot of people that we cannot accept. They come to do their own thing, so we generally send them to a different program. Some of the worst volunteers, by the way, are teachers.

Question:

We talked about empathy, and we talked about a certain personality, both of which are difficult to identify other than through a performance based program. What particular skills do you note are very valuable for working with this population of students?

Response:

I would say reading. We have tried a number of different approaches and now, when we begin with an illiterate, we only teach him words that are within his own speaking vocabulary.

Question:

Where do you move from this point?

Response:

On-the-job training.

Question:

If we are going to train these teachers you asked for, what basic skills do you feel these people should have when they get to you?

Response:

Any subject from which people can take experiences and apply them in their everyday lives is good. Physics is a beautiful place to start because it deals with natural laws. Everybody experiences gravity. Social studies is important only in associations you can make among people -- realizing that they all have certain basic needs, and what was true about Columbus is true about John Glen. Right now, I feel a tremendous deficiency in knowing what you do in a foundry, because all of my students are working in a foundry. I go home, open the encyclopedia, and look up castings and moldings. What I would prefer is hiring someone who has worked in a foundry all his life to teach these men.

Question:

Does a Mexican-American man have any problem in maintaining his masculine identity when you, a woman, are his teacher?

Response:

Yes, being a woman makes a lot of difference because the lower socio-economic people feel that a female isn't supposed to have much mentality.

Question:

I have noticed they tend to lose respect for a woman, but it is generally earned after a period of time.

Response:

I never really had that problem, but I usually run my classes on an informal basis. I don't stand up. I sit down with the rest, and we usually try to get some kind of interaction going by talking about things they bring up. When sex is mentioned, for instance, we go into what it really means in everyday living for them or for the man out there. We generally get around to the meaning of love, because most of these men have marriage problems. I really think the program would run better with male instructors, but we don't have the money to hire men.

Question:

Are you tied with programs like Upward Bound?

Response:

We do train people to take the GED, but most of the time we aim at people who wouldn't get into these programs because they are afraid of them. Most of the poor are quite hostile to school, and I think I can explain why. In Salt Lake the schools are usually controlled by what the poor view as the Establishment. For this same reason, most of the poor do not go to church, and Salt Lake is looked upon as a church-oriented community. The poor smoke and drink coffee, among other things, so they feel they are rejected by the schools whether they are or not.

Question:

What kinds of backgrounds do your tutors have? Do they come from poverty groups, or do they have middle class backgrounds?

Response:

None of our tutors who have come out of the poverty groups have been successful, to be honest with you.

Question:

They can't go back to their own?

Response:

They can, and there are more and more that want to go back to help. The reason that we haven't been able to use paraprofessionals is because they cannot afford to volunteer their time.

Question:

Has this program been working towards linkages with the Salt Lake City schools or the University of Utah?

Response:

We have tried to coordinate with other education programs, but they don't see the problem the same way we do. I will say that we are still working on it, and one of our goals next year is to coordinate these efforts in adult education.

Question:

I noticed that you are on a first name basis with your students. Would you talk about that? There is some move now in that direction even in the elementary and secondary schools. Would you comment on how important that is in establishing a relationship with your students?

Response:

Well, I think when you are Mr., Mrs., Dr., etc., it is a bridge. You always call your friends by their first name, and I just can't get across to you enough that the poor aren't like the people that go to community action programs. If I want to be a friend of that person, I have to call him by his first name, and this is the way I start out. We do have one student that I call Mrs.________. She has always kept at a distance, but she calls me Suzanne, and I am Suzanne to everybody.

Question:

I think the problem in being unable to individualize relates to the unwillingness of the teacher to go around with the individual student and spend enough time so that he can talk about some of his problems and needs and come up with what he wants to study. Would you care to comment on that?

Response:

We don't have good enough evaluation techniques to be able to quickly determine that, although they are getting better. I worry, though, that while they are improving for middle class children, I don't think they are for the lower socioeconomic child, and it will take a lot of finding out what this child needs.

Question:

Another point that is really important for the training of teachers is that teacher education, as far as I see, doesn't prepare people to listen to someone talk to them. So much of the time the student has listened to the professor just chewing out at him, and he has never had the time to come back. So he repeats that when getting into his own classroom -- talking out and not letting it come from the students. I suppose this is the result of having a desk in front of the room and someone standing behind the podium.

Response:

I think it does, and do you know one of the things that the poor say to me all the time? I ask them what they would do if they could change the schools, and they say, "I would get better teachers." I ask them what they mean by better teachers, and they tell me, "Someone that can really teach me what I want to know." It's that simple.

Question:

Another kind of standardization is the certification process where we select people who have already been socialized and make them adult education personnel. Would you like to react to that?

Response:

I can't, because when I graduated from the University, I really didn't have any particular skills as a teacher. Certainly in the secondary schools, when we take sixth grade children from Central City and promote them to Junior High School, about 60 percent are below their grade level. Yet, their teachers aren't trained to handle children with those deficiencies. They have been certified without learning the skills that are needed. So I think we will have to work on better skills in all of education.

Question:

I come from Southern Louisiana where the language problem is not Spanish but French. We have isolated poor, and we have Indians, and in the small rural schools that serve most of these people we have an informal, ungraded situation. Many of these youngsters spend three years in the first grade. During the first year they just learn to use the bathroom instead of the floor, and they learn some English. It literally takes three years to bring these children up to the first grade level. I think many times in the push, push, push of school systems, we don't give children time to do some school learning. Let's face it, the dropout has never done any school learning. We are all successful in the system because we learned to know the school, and we beat the system. I think that some of our rural teachers who were born and brought up in these communities and the principals in those schools have devised a pretty successful situation working with children this way. Maybe this sort of thing would work with some of these adults. Let's not be so middle-class conscious that we don't take the necessary effort to establish a learning base from which we can go. In ABE-GED programs, it is necessary to push students up to the next grade level, but in the literacy programs we are playing in a different ball park, and we are playing with different people. They have got to do some learning before they are ready to even acquire the most basic literacy skills.

Response:

Speaking of the GED, it is interesting that Job Corps correlated the Standard Achievement Tests with the GED, and you can actually pass with an eighth grade reading level. Yet, we have sent a lot of people to take it with an eighth grade reading level that didn't pass it, so it takes other things also.

A REPORT OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD PROJECT IN ADULT LEARNING

Charles E. Kozoll

For many years the Southeast has had the highest number of uneducated and undereducated adults. Nearly 25 percent of the total number of functional illiterates reside in eight Southeastern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia , Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee).

Black and white -- young and old, rural and urban --, these individuals require fundamental and remedial education to fully participate in the life of their local communities and states. Many of these persons are unable to fill out job applications, or correctly apply for medical and welfare assistance available to them. Many require help to master reading, fundamental mathematics, and social living skills -- the skills needed to enter the job market or improve their present job. Basic education also reaches out to them by providing instruction in home, health, and child care.

Individual state interest has varied. Only one state, Florida, has had a substantial program in adult and adult basic education over the last fifteen years. Vocational and junior college programs expanded when federal monies became available in increased amounts in 1964. Since the onset of major federal funding in 1965, most state departments of education instituted divisions responsible for both adult basic and continuing education. Many of these programs are based in local and county public school systems. Others are sponsored by private organizations and public manpower training programs.

Personnel who work with these adults are usually public school teachers and administrators. The majority have had little or no

---

Charles E. Kozoll, Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, received his undergraduate and initial graduate education in political science (University of Michigan and Boston University) and combined this with adult education for a Columbia University doctorate. He has since worked in industrial and adult education training programs, and he is currently Associate Director of the Southern Regional Education Board's Adult Basic Education Project.

training in how to teach adults, and sometimes adapt methods used with elementary and high school students to the adult learner. Nearly all of them are part-time -- "education's moonlighters."

There are efforts to institutionalize adult learning facilities and individualize instructions through learning labs, and daytime programs for adult students as part of on-the-job training Only three institutions of higher education in the Southeast have developed courses to train professionals in adult education, and specifically prepare teachers to work with undereducated adults.

The Southeast's problems were extensive; other regions of the United States faced the same difficulties. Realizing this national need, state directors of adult education organized a national council in 1966. It began to address some of their common problems and the need for coordination and the development of common solutions. These national meetings established an opportunity for directors in the Southeast to meet on a regular basis, and explore means by which they could collectively deal with the region's need for more trained professionals in adult education.

Region IV state directors were encouraged by the Office of Education to prepare a regional plan. Complementary programs for training adult education teachers and supervisors through higher educational work, local in-service training, and State Department of Education resources were sought. The Office of Education was interested in securing a leadership position for the state director and his staff; establishing complementary activities across the region, avoiding unnecessary duplication of training facilities, and insuring meaningful participation by regional colleges and universities who had not been involved in adult education. Underlying this support was the notion that through such a comprehensive effort, needed "professionalism" could be nurtured in the Southeast. The U. S. Office of Education, state directors and staff were anxious to institutionalize AE and ABE, and make it a full-time concern maintained by adequately trained persons.

The importance of regional cooperation was underlined by the selection of the Southern Regional Education Board as project administrator. SREB is an interstate compact established 22 years ago by the Southern Governors' Conference. It has coordinated activities between higher education and state governments, and stimulated innovation in higher education throughout the South. One significant phase of its work has been to examine and hasten the improvement of black institutions. For those reasons, the Southern Regional Education Board was asked to become Project grantee, and insure that each activity was established within the states, and across the Southeast.

More than a year has passed since the project activities began in the six original states. Kentucky and North Carolina joined the group on July 1, 1970.

All eight states have begun activities in the four phases of the program, operated under the direction of the state adult education director.

a. The higher education capabilities program is designed to establish or enhance the ability of at least two institutions of higher education in each state to provide pre- and in-service training to ABE personnel through undergraduate and graduate courses and degree programs.

b. The continuing consultant program is an extension of college and university involvement. It facilitates contact between professors and students and local teachers and coordinators. Through this contact, problems at the classroom level have been defined, confronted and, hopefully, solved.

   These field experiences are also designed to help instructors gather information on teacher needs and use it to make courses and programs more relevant to AE/ABE staff.

c. The local in-service capabilities program is training personnel in local areas to provide their own in-service activities. Institutional staffs supply initial training to supervisors and prepare them to become trainers. In-service training programs are now available in local areas on a regular basis. Through this program both short and long seminars, one-day conferences, within driving distance of all teachers have been and are being held.

d. The state department of education in-service leadership program is designed to increase the ability of these staff to provide in-service leadership for local and institutional programs, and to coordinate staff training and development activities within each state.

Two specific regional programs support and extend individual state efforts:

a. The regional seminars have brought together state department, institutional and local program staffs for discussion of issues related to teacher training and staff development, and to define common needs and to examine the roles played by each group within the state. There was some initial reluctance to hold these discussions. The seminar was a structured environment for that activity, and facilitated some acceptance of different roles played by each group. The planning process itself has also been examined and, in some cases, state plans for staff resource identification and allocation have been outlined.

b. The technical Services Program is an effort to solve specific problems in higher education and teacher training. Expertise from the region and the nation is employed to seek solutions; these solutions can take the form of services or materials made available throughout the Southeast.

The six complementary activities lead to regular and sequential training through individual courses, degree programs and highly specialized seminars and workshops. The actual training responsibilities and support services are carried out through the institution-based programs, the continuing consultant activities, and the local in-service resources which provide on-the-spot training to teachers. The state department of education insures there are adequate resources and facilities available to train all persons who work with adults. The state department has the additional responsibility of working with statewide planning teams and developing a comprehensive program for staff training.

The regional seminars are an extension of these activities and enable professional personnel to meet on a regular basis to examine individual state problems through a regional perspective and to gain the benefits of cooperative discussion in arriving at problem solutions. The problem solutions may be in regional services too costly and technical to be duplicated in each of the participating states. Although the Project began very quickly over a year ago, and many institutions entered into the not fully prepared, surprising and indeed dramatic quantitative gains were made during this first year.

Sixteen institutions of higher education participated in Project activities through course offerings, degree programs, workshops, and seminars the first year. There are now 21 in the eight states. Thirteen of these colleges and universities including one predominantly black institution in each state, have established adult education divisions for the first time. Sixteen programs leading to Masters, Six-year Certificates and Doctorates were added to six existing programs, a 226 percent increase. Nineteen additional programs are planned.

Twenty-nine full-time adult education faculty were employed by participating institutions.

Sixteen graduate students actively participated in university program activities, and assisted the state departments of education in providing in-service training to local ABE personnel.

Sixty-one graduate and undergraduate courses were added. An additional 33 were planned.

2,971 students enrolled in credit courses offered on-campus, off-campus and by extension or through seven two-week institutes held at six universities.

7,800 teachers, nearly 90 percent of the Southeast's adult basic education staff, attended courses, institutes, seminars and workshops.

4,735 teachers and supervisors attended more than 118 seminars and workshops to begin regular in-service training for ABE personnel.

337 ABE classes and programs were visited by college and university staff, providing assistance to teachers and supervisors in instructional methods and the selection of materials.

Teacher-trainer teams were established in two of the six states to make training available in selected geographical areas.

Cooperative university, state department of education and local coordinator planning teams to schedule in-service programs were instituted in two other states. Responsibility for developing ongoing professional training plans was assumed in all states, either by the adult education director or a member of his staff.

400 local ABE program, state department of education and institutional personnel attended three regional seminars to examine the staff development process and discuss inputs for individual state plans.

Seventeen teachers of ABE for the blind and visually handicapped were trained at two special institutes.

In addition to quantitative gains, many relationships have been established.

These ties began to emerge among the state directors of adult education five years ago. They have now grown to touch concerned groups in the Southeast. Federal interest and support continues through the Office of Education's regional program officer who works on a regular basis with Project staff to enhance the leadership role of the state directors. His efforts are responsible in part for increased amounts of state grant funds being applied to support summer teacher training institutes and for increased emphasis on classroom techniques and methods in seminars and workshops.

The continuing interest of the regional officer and representatives from the Adult Education Division in Washington underline the federal commitment to the Project and the expectation that nationwide lessons will be derived from this work.

Planning groups fostering state cohesiveness have begun to emerge, and this cohesiveness has helped to produce more relevant in-service activities.

State directors have continued to work as an advisory group to the Project's staff.

The state education departments have begun to recognize that the planning function is ongoing and have designated persons with that responsibility. A dialogue on the improvement of professional staff and institutions is increasing.

Progress has been made, but a great deal remains to be done. Underlying all activities is the notion that the state departments of education should act to coordinate adult and adult basic education training within the states. A much firmer leadership position must be secured for the director and his staff, their roles and responsibilities more clearly defined.

The consultant title is used liberally; little is understood of the nature of this person's responsibilities. The consultant role must be more clearly defined, especially as it relates to the function of university personnel when they visit local programs and provide assistance.

Local programs are not yet able to conduct pre- and in-service teacher training. As they work to build this competence, state departments of education, colleges, and universities must work with them to define the types of training needed and the resources both professional groups could provide.

Because of the thrust to develop state programs, little effort has been applied to define regionwide technical services which can best supplement each state program.

While blacks form the largest group of ABE students in the region, and significant numbers of blacks are involved as teachers, little has been done to stimulate the growth of black leadership in supervisory, state department and institutional positions.

The Southeast has begun to grow together, but more difficult tasks lie ahead

---quality and depth must be added to the quantity of activities begun

---planning of training and professional development activities must become a serious and continuous endeavor

---the importance of cooperation and mutual respect to the growth of useful training programs must be established

---the resources of teacher, administrator, professor, black and white must be recognized and respected

---unique cooperative programs must demonstrate that states can collaborate regionally in their activities and services -- avoiding needless duplication of effort.

The Southeast led the nation in establishing a cooperative program. The next two years will determine if staff development becomes institutionalized, collective, well planned -- or irregular efforts sponsored by the whims of federal funding.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Charles E. Kozoll

Question:

Were there any precedents to your Southern Regional Education Board Project?

Response:

Originally there were three institutions involved in this sort of work. They were: Florida State University at Tallahassee, which started 24 years ago with Coolie Verner, then the program at North Carolina State, and three years ago, the University of Georgia was invited to start programs leading to a Master's and Doctorate through the cooperative effort with the State Department of Education in Georgia. The original man has since left. Now Curtis Ulmer has a staff of several people at the University of Georgia.

There were other courses on the books at other institutions throughout the Southeast. Auburn University had started about a year or two before the project began. Mississippi State had a man on board somewhat beforehand. Memphis State was thinking of hiring someone. Tuskegee Institute had been involved, but theirs was nowhere near the scope that the project has facilitated.

There's one other point to add: one black institution in each state is an active participant in the project. I should say in all candidness that at the start there was a lot of reluctance to involve the black institutions. The state directors of education had had little or no contact with the black institutions. The ABE or adult education personnel had probably never been to the campuses nor knew much about the faculty there. The white institutions, I think, felt that they could do the job as well or better than the black institutions, and the professors had indicated that they thought it was a slur on their abilities to operate across color lines. I think if you know anything about the history of higher education in the South, you know that there has been until lately a real separation between black and white institutions, which is now disappearing. I think that blacks were very reluctant to get started in the program, because they were very unsure whether they would become equal partners in the activities once federal money stopped and that there would be no honest participation. It's my opinion that a lot of those fears and suspicions have been allayed in a year's time, and that there is very active, articulate black leadership coming to the foreground within the states.

Question:

What did you really accomplish in terms of the evaluation techniques that have been used in your region.

Response:

That's really two questions. In-service training has varied from attendance at regular courses within driving distance of their programs to attendance at the summer two-week seminars with the state departments of education cooperating with a local program and bringing in a university person for a short time. I should say that the quality of this in-service training varies from fairly good to poor. But I think one of the important things that has been established is a critical base for the sort of effective teaching that we want to see in adult classrooms throughout the Southeast: most of the teachers who had all their training to work with primary school children have begun to see that there is a substantial psychological difference between working with an adult and working with a child, and we have gone some distance in making that distinction clear. I'm not at all satisfied that we have developed the sorts of training mechanisms that involve the teachers enough so that they feel the difference. In terms of evaluating the success of our efforts, I think there is one particular way we are using evaluation to improve the quality of the teacher training that goes on. This is something undertaken with a certain degree of reluctance by university people. They have become a little more accustomed to it over the last year, and there have been some changes that surprise me. I would say the most unique part of our program is the continuing consultant effort which makes it possible for university instructional staff to spend approximately a third of their time working with local programs. The traditional relationship of a university person going to a local program is for him to come down from the mountain and say, "You should do this, and this, and this." I think we have changed that slightly, and I would like to see it changed even more. The University people, both faculty and graduate students, are to observe and use the observations that they make to revise their courses. We don't want them to feel that the courses and programs they develop are hard and fixed. They have to be changed and modified as the training needs of their clients emerge, as they see new techniques and new problems that they want to use as case studies. We want them to be open to suggestions for change and have a regularized means of going into the areas to see that change by virtue of the fact that so many of the faculty are in regular contact with the state departments of education personnel. In one state they work almost as a team going and doing all of their visiting together. That is the type of evaluation that we use to modify the sorts of training that are going on in the region.

Question:

How do you evaluate student progress?

Response:

I actually have nothing to do with student progress in the sense of the ABE students. I'm afraid to say that much is done in the very traditional grade-norm way; we haven't been able to break that hold on the population. Unfortunately, so much of the teacher training that goes on in ABE and in general, is made up of homilies about how you should love adults and learn to respect their experiences. Very few dramatic experiences are introduced into the training so that a teacher of adults gets to internalize it. Our dropout rate, I suppose, is about traditional in ABE throughout the country. We just had a survey of 600 people who attended our institute and asked them to estimate the dropout rate. They estimated between 40 and 60 percent, which I think is reasonably standard.

Question:

Will you comment a little more on the issue of role perception and function perception between the university people and their training aspects, and the state department staffs and their training perceptions aspects? It relates partially to control, or at least that is the way it comes out.

Response:

I'm reminded of a story that George Kennan used in his book on Russia under Stalin, which described the difficulties that capitalists and communists have in communicating with each other. It is like two cross-eyed men walking into each other in the street and one turning to the other and saying, "Why don't you look out where you are going?" They are both trying to reach the same point, but they argue about terminology and relevance.

There is another problem that really grieves me in the Southeast, and this relates to the State Department of Education. They create what I would call a shibboleth: "You university people up there in the Ivory Tower, you don't know what is going on in the field." With the exception of one person, let's say two people, all of the faculty that are full-time in ABE and adult education in the Southeast have had experience as ABE teachers, ABE coordinators, and on the state department of education staff. They are not Ivory Tower people. So I think that this is indicative of a traditional relationship that exists between the state departments and the universities.

On the other hand, I think that the universities have been somewhat thoughtless in the ways they have approached state department of education staffs. I would go so far as to say that in some cases they regard the persons who have responsibility in a very patronizing way. And that patronizing attitude is observable and irritates SDE staff. Yet they are working toward the same goal. As they are able to come out and talk about these differences, we move toward getting some of these out on the table. I might say we had to go through a lot of the exercises we went through this morning to get them to put some things on the table that were really bothering them. Now what we have in the Southeast, in practically every state, is a state-wide planning group of SDE staff, university personnel, and local program people. They sit down and figure out what sorts of training they need, and they have gotten past the stage where everyone is coming in very tight with his little black book closed, and now they talk to each other.

Question:

One of the things that Suzanne was talking about this morning was a recruiting program. You know, there is a credibility gap among these kinds of people and our institutions, including yours and mind. Have you propagated any particular technique for reaching those people, or do you just open the door and say, "Here we are folks, come and get educated?"

Response:

I think you have to realize the distinction between the work that Suzanne and I are involved in. I'm strictly concerned with the training of personnel who will teach these people. She is concerned with actually teaching the students, so that recruitment, a subject that comes up in training, is not something with which we are directly concerned.

I want to point out that wherever you get ABE people, you always have to talk about the problem of recruitment and retention. I think that one of the things we have to consider is that recruitment and retention are just the symptoms of some of the underlying weaknesses that we have in ABE, which were alluded to this morning. Until we get our teachers away from talking about that and getting them to examine their own attitudes as they affect the willingness of people to stay in the class and to become honest about what the real needs are, I think we are treading water, and we're sinking.

Question:

How do you do it?

I wish I had a pat answer, but let me talk about a particular way of operation that I have seen in our institute programs among our professors in the Southeast that I think is the antithesis of the sort of attitude you want to develop. As adult educators, I would suppose that most of our operation is based on the fact that we genuinely respect all of the people who come into our classes and that we are willing to draw out their experiences and listen to them. Yet, in so many of the institutes I have seen, you find a situation where the man is right up there in front of the lectern, he's talking from notes, and he is spewing out the same way that he did when I was taking political science or history or any of the subjects that people were quoting verbatim. I've seen little of the sorts of group activities which create an atmosphere for the people to start reflecting, talking, and getting comfortable with each other. Or I have seen little of the activities which place an emotional strain on a person, so that he begins to feel that maybe he isn't exactly honest about what he is saying or how he's looking at a person. I've seen little of these activities. Maybe they are part of the answer, but I think we are still so caught up in what we have done so far as teacher training is concerned that we haven't made that crucial turning of the corner from working with elementary students; and I am not sure that we are that successful with elementary education for working with adults.

Question:

I would like to say in relation to a training program that was carried on in a university last summer that the interesting thing was the tremendous insecurity of administrators in facing this kind of situation. The college and university people were not giving them pat answers, and it put them in the position of developing the answer, whereas they wanted to be in a position of criticizing what was provided them by some outsider.

Response:

I agree with Charles that whether it be with the potential adult basic education student, or the high school dropout, or the elementary person that is having difficulty in school, I just do not think we have allowed ourselves to discover what the real problem is, because it would shake us up too much if we did. There are things going on in our society, call them social trends, that are going to bring this about.

The question is whether we want to loosen up our own thinking so that we can be a constructive force rather than a negative or indifferent force, and be by-passed. As far as institutions are concerned, monasteries in the Middle Ages were primarily educational institutions, if I understand my history correctly, and they couldn't respond to the rise of commercialism. You know, I don't see many monasteries around, but I don't take the position that we are incapable of responding because history tells me that some institutions have not been.

We must allow our thinking to extend to the point where we can grasp the real problem in terms of what we think about persons. In other words, we think of persons as aggregates, a bunch of deans here and other persons there, but that's not true. Each one of you is a person. This is what we are moving into, and that's where I think we have to start seeing things.

Question:

In that connection, do you have any kind of training models tried out with one degree of success or another that could be consumed by people elsewhere? It seems to me that in the light of what you said, this is a key necessity, because otherwise we are in the position of encouraging institutions of higher education to adopt programs which will repeat some of the errors in the present programs. Where are the models? Is the FSE program something that ought to be emulated?

Response:

I caution you very strongly to avoid looking for models. I think you are all very educated, skillful people. I think you are capable of going back to your own areas, talking with each other within your states, and with people who need training, and then determining the sorts of courses that are going to be relevant to your needs.

Question:

You are talking to the wrong people when you say that. We are not the people who sit down and write courses and programs. We administer programs.

Response:

That's not a realistic distinction. You have the leadership capability to ensure that there is a clear identification of the needs for training within your area of service, and that the people who are doing the actual development have consulted with all of those who have an input to make---not only from the University community, but from education at large. You have the ability to question the sorts of programs they have come up with, not based on any preconceived model that you may have taken from another part of the country, but on what you see as your own needs, the needs you have to satisfy, and the university responsibilities in that area. That is why I caution the use of examples from other parts of the country.

One of the unfortunate things we were working hard to break was the fact that many of our faculty members were products of institutions with very fast and tight programs. What they have done is gone out somewhere else and duplicated that program. In some cases it meets a need. In other cases it falls flat. I would hate to see a duplication of Florida State. Invite personnel from other parts of the country to criticize and consult, but by no means try to replicate what they are doing.

Question:

Your basic suggestion seems to me to be in the direction of sensitivity training, small group sessions, and the development of awareness in the minds of other people.

Response:

This is a technique but not a model of a program. It is only a very small part of the entire training program. I would urge you to consider three aspects of what we have done as having possible relevance for your own developmental programs here.

The first is the continuing consultant program I discussed before, which brings the faculty into local areas on a fairly regular basis, so that they are seen not as persons who have come with a message. When I was in Africa and had stomach trouble, I used to go to the hospital and the attendant gave me a bottle of white stuff that said, "The Mixture." I said, "Isn't this 'a' mixture?" "No, that's the mixture," he said. Too often university people coming out of the community have been charged with coming with "the" message. I think that as their appearance becomes more regular and they are observed as being both givers and receivers, their presence will be less of a threat, and they can begin to gather information, listen to what is going on, sense the dynamics of the classroom, and extrapolate some of the sense that goes on in the give and take between you and your students. If professors can pull that out and apply it in the training of their teachers, they will be ahead.

The second part that I think has potentially great significance for our region is the fact that we are building the competence at local levels to conduct their own in-service training. We are breaking the reliance on university expertise, and turning it into help that can be called upon for very specific skills. We are trying to break the title of the consultant coming in with the answer, because local people have a lot of the skills for running their own in-service training programs, given the proper support.

The third thing that I urge you to consider is the extent to which institutions within a state can cooperate and use their resources in a complementary way. Let me give you a couple of examples that indicate this in the two states which are furthest along in that area.

Possibly the state furthest along in terms of this complementary relationship is Mississippi. Mississippi has developed a pattern where four institutions divide geographical and subject area specialization. Old Miss, when it begins working in the program, will concentrate on relationships with business and industry in bringing them into training and working with their management people. They will serve the Northeast quarter of Mississippi. Mississippi State will serve the Northwest quarter and is already concentrating on teacher-training teams consisting of five people, each with a different subject matter specialization, which work with local programs in their in-service activities. Jackson State College in Jackson is responsible for training all new ABE teachers coming into the program and for providing field support, and they serve the Jackson City area as well as the area around Jackson extending as far away as Meridian. The University of Southern Mississippi at Hattiesburg has a very established program in reading, and they are very skilled in teaching reading to adults. They serve the Southern part of Mississippi in providing training for people in teaching reading to adults. That's the Mississippi program which is divided up geographically and by area of specialization.

In Georgia, they divided the state into quadrants. The University of Georgia is sort of the focal point because it runs the doctoral program and allows institutions that only offer undergraduate credit to offer graduate credit by approving their instructors as being on the graduate faculty of the University of Georgia. The University of Georgia works with the Northeast quadrant. West Georgia works with the Northwest quadrant of the state, and is beginning to develop specialization in English as a second language. It is also working with the large prison programs in the greater Atlanta area. Albany State, a black institution, services the Southwest quadrant of the state and is concentrating on rural education, which is very unique. It is in this part of the Black Belt that you have poor sharecroppers. They run some of the finest in-service programs in the whole state of Georgia. Georgia Southern at Statesboro services the Southeast quadrant of the state and is concentrating on individualized instruction and the development of a learning lab.

The same sort of pattern will begin to emerge in Alabama. In Florida the institutions are divided up in terms of the geographical areas and they all sit together on the statewide group that does planning for the state. Kentucky, which just started in July, is moving in that direction. So you have that differentiation of responsibility, which is a way of dividing up the pie, and it is dividing up the resources we have available.

Question:

You said a little while ago that some of the training programs in your institutions were fairly good and some were poor. What are your criteria for fairly good and for poor?

Response:

I am speaking of personal criteria. Some of my criteria are the degree to which there is a dialogue within the sessions, the degree to which participants define what their objectives are for that training experience, and the degree to which they can say they were able to meet those objectives at the conclusion. Two other criteria are the extent to which local people who are in need of the training have participated in planning the activity and the extent to which a more relevant training experience that will meet their needs has resulted. When I go around, I get a feel of the ability of staff people to talk with others, to get down to the underlying problems that are bothering people in the classes, and the extent to which they are getting away from simply talking about their successes to talking about some of the problems they are facing in their classes. These are all very subjective things about which I have personal feelings.

Question:

Charles, I think that one of our hangups in education and administration is that a lot of our thinking is still limited to training in the so-called traditional manner---the traditional pattern, credit, and this type of thing. I think we are also being overly concerned about whether it is going to be graduate or undergraduate. I think we are failing to really grasp the core of the problem. What we need to do is find the need and then the approach that works. You can take the teacher with the master's degree and the person that has just completed the GED, throw them altogether, and you have a very successful plan, because they will complement each other. If something comes up, the person who just finished the GED knows the experience and he can be a much better teacher in helping the so-called "professionals" in understanding the problems than the person who hasn't experienced those problems. I think a lot of times we have to do away with some of the traditional ways of teaching with which we have been brought up.

Response:

Another factor to consider is that at this point in time, you are at various stages of development. Considering these programs now is somewhat premature. The dynamism of your degree programs will be the extent to which they have taken shape based on increased levels of training need that the teachers and administrators articulate.

We all went through doctoral programs that were present before we got there, and I imagine we all have some of the same sorts of feelings about them. One of the great turn-offs to people who want additional training as ABE teachers is having to go for a master's, a sixth-year certificate, or certification. They couldn't care about any one of the three. They may just want one single course, and a group of courses may then emerge toward a degree.

Question:

How do you get a teacher of adults into such a program if he is moonlighting? He teaches high school during the day, he teaches adults at night, and there is no certificate to flutter.

Response:

I think you start out by getting into his classes, seeing him on some sort of regular basis, and working with him until you can get to the point of making suggestions about what sorts of training he needs. You start small with in-service activities that may only take a morning, getting the program supervisor to let his teachers off for a period of time when they teach classes, and you build up the realization that they can benefit from the training. I'm afraid that in some places, for example in the Southeast, we are using the hammer of certification to pound people into courses, and I'm not really sure what those courses will do when they are on the books. It may be that we are just perpetuating the same locked-in system that persists in elementary and secondary education.

Question:

How do you view a performance-based certification?

Response:

It is interesting that you ask this question. I wrote to the Commissioner of New York State about this several weeks ago, and his reaction was that performance-based certification sounds very appealing, and a lot of people have jumped on the bandwagon without knowing what the wagon contains or where it is going. I really don't know much about performance-based certification. The little reading I have done doesn't clear it up for me.

Question:

I don't know either, but let's go one step further from everything you have talked about so far. You are using performance as recruitment, and you are actually tying certification to performance. What we are trying to do, and encountering resistance in the process, is buck a car that is already in motion, because the problem for SDE people and higher education is the roots that have been established in traditional teacher training.

Question:

I have talked to some of your SDE people. They have a feeling that there ought to be better guidelines. While they won't use the word "certification," they will say "guidelines" for recognizing which teacher it ought to be. Some of them are going begging now looking for guidelines, whether it means a set of specific courses or something else.

Response:

Don't look for cookbooks and recipes like so many other people. I think what you can bring to it is all the experience you have had in preparing people to work in education. You must have a sense of what is effective in a classroom, and what sorts of things make a teacher click with a group of students. Through observation of what those are in adult classes, you can come out with some "guides" that can be used.

Question:

You have got to have something. You can't just go helter-skelter.

Response:

I did not advocate going awry. I am saying that we should look at examples of success and how they are generated. We should look at examples of failure and get a sense of what interactions exist in the classrooms and how ABE is functioning, at low and high levels. Then you can come out cooperatively with some guides that can be part of teacher training and part of some performance-based certification. Don't lock yourself in from the start. Build up to something that you can live with.

THEORIES OF ADULT LEARNING FOR TEACHERS OF ADULTS

Howard Y. McClusky

I am sure that many of you in this audience have had the experience of being asked to perform on an occasion like this. As prospective performers we try, as far as possible, to anticipate the probable make-up and size of the audience, the goals of the conference, and the part our performance is expected by the conference planners to play in serving the conference goals. But there is always and inevitably a gap between our efforts at prediction and the live situation that emerges at the actual time of performance. Hence, as prospective performers (in this case, speechmakers), we come 'loaded' for what we think the assignment calls for, but at the same time, we must be prepared to make last minute changes as we make our presentation. Nothing is more deadening than being compelled to listen to a carefully prepared, even 'canned' address, often read from a manuscript which, taken alone, may be all right, but is far 'off target' for the realities of the situation in which it is delivered. Whatever else my presentation here turns out to be, I hope at least to be 'on-target.' To do this, I am sticking with my pre-conference preparations, but am making some last minute changes in emphasis and format in order to tune in more appropriately on what I believe this particular point in the conference program requires.

First of all, I want to pay my compliments to the 'craftsmanship' of Alton Hadlock and his staff in arranging this program. Beginning in early July (1970), he has worked with the Divisions of Adult Education in the Departments of Public Instruction in most of the states west of the Mississippi River, as well as the key and relevant administrators in the institutions regarded as eligible to

---

Howard Y. McClusky, Ph.D., University of Chicago, is a Professor Emeritus of Adult Education and Educational Psychology at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and is currently a Visiting Professor of Adult Education at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. He is also a consultant on adult education to the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. He was the charter president of the Adult Education Association and has received the Delbert Clark Award for Education.

participate in the project. All this has provided data for building the conference agenda and has generated a process for 'readying' the conferees for their participation in the conference itself. At the same time, however, the ultimate goal of the project is what goes on back home in action after the conference is over. So if we were placing the total effort of the project on a flow chart, our days of meeting here would merely be a point of transition, a point of culmination for pre-conference field work on the one hand and a launching pad for post-conference implementation on the other hand. In other words, I believe that the procedures being used in the project constitute a good example of effective adult education practice and as such is thoroughly consistent with the general goals which the project is designed to achieve. It is a privilege to be associated with a project which in its operation 'practices what it preaches.'

Turning now to the main thrust of my argument, I would like to begin by looking briefly at some of the forces now gaining momentum in our society which are making the continuing education of adults a new 'imperative' for our times. Clearly, we are immersed in a stream of change so pervasive, so drastic and so rapid, that its consequences are virtually revolutionary in character. We cannot refashion the dislocation and solve the problems produced by these changes by a process of trial and error and improvisation. To do so is to flirt with destruction. Our only hope lies in investing our affairs with as much information, wisdom and rationality as possible. As a consequence, the concept of a 'Learning Society,' i.e. a society that must engage in a process of continual learning in order to master the impact of change, is not moonshine, but a concept the implementation of which is necessary for survival. Translated into more operational and individual terms, it means simply that we have now entered a period of what Peter Drucker calls the Age of 'Discontinuity' where more specifically the 'educated youth of today, is the obsolete adult of tomorrow' unless he continues to learn.

I do not care what your back home position may be, but as leaders in some aspect of the educational enterprise, you can no longer escape the profound and irreversible impact of the growing momentum of change. Every nook and cranny of the educational domain will ultimately, and sooner than many of us realize, be compelled to make some institutional response. And one aspect of this response, namely the development of programs of instruction in adult education as a discipline, is I take it what this conference and the project of which it is part, is all about.

Let us mention quickly some straws in the wind. The first meeting of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (a Division of the Adult Education Association of the USA) was held at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor in 1947. The last meeting was held in Atlanta, Georgia, in late October (1970). In this 13 year span, the membership of the Commission has grown seven fold, reflecting in large part the growth of institutional involvement in the field. A similar growth has been occurring in the domain of research. Not more than 8 years ago, fewer than 20 young researchers gathered together to present and react to the investigations they were undertaking. Last year, over 125 persons attended a meeting of the Adult Education Research Council, a direct descendant of the original group of 20, in Minneapolis, to discuss and listen to research reports presented by persons holding major academic appointments, not only in adult education, but in many of the adjacent disciplines of the humanities and behavioral sciences.

Another straw in the wind is the report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education chaired by Clark Kerr, which has been released within the last few weeks. According to the description of this document, which recently appeared in the New York Times, the Commission placed heavy emphasis on the importance of life long or continuing education, not only for the professions, but also as a matter of continuing general education for the non-professional. More specifically, you will recall its recommendation that henceforth colleges require 3 instead of 4 years for the baccalaureate degree with the expectation that people will return for continuing instruction at various points throughout the remainder of their lives.

Yet another straw is Title III 'The Adult Education Act' of bill H.R. 514 now on the agenda of both Houses of Congress. Quoting from the official statement of purpose:

> 'Sec. 302. It is the purpose of this title to expand educational opportunity and encourage the establishment of programs of adult public education that will enable ALL adults to CONTINUE their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school and make available the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive and responsible citizens.'

This bill has been over 8 years in the making, and in its present form represents the bi-partisan consensus of both the

House and the Senate. When fully implemented, it will represent a Landmark, not only in the history of Adult Education, but also public education as a whole, both in the USA and elsewhere.

The domain of adult education as a field of academic study is still in a fluid and formative stage, presenting an unmatched opportunity for frontiersmanship. At the same time, however, some structure is beginning to appear.

First, there is the introduction to the field. This includes some history and philosophy, some assessment of forces giving rise to the need for continuing education, as well as an examination of some of the major institutional and programmatic forms in which the practice of adult education occurs.

Then there is the general area of adult psychology, which for adult education is composed of two aspects: one dealing with adult development, and the other with adult learning. Another subject unique to the field is what might be called the adult education approach to community development. This is still greatly in need of clarification and cultivation, but it embraces a domain of inquiry greatly relevant to modern society and currently by-passed by the present programs of academic offerings.

In addition to the above, there are also the areas of methodology and materials (i.e. andragogy rather than pedagogy, and its implementing procedures and instructional resources), program development, evaluation, and so forth.

Of course, instruction in adult education will always draw heavily on the adjacent domains of the behavioral sciences, the humanities, and communication. But our purpose here is to indicate briefly that there is an emerging core of subject matter in the field as an academic discipline and that when combined with an appropriate combination of collateral subjects, it is possible to put together a respectable and highly functional program of academic inquiry. But in concluding this part of my discussion, I want to repeat that the field is still in a yeasty and tentative stage of emergence and there is, therefore, an excellent opportunity for innovation in curriculum development. It is still very much an 'open system' ripe for creative in-put.

Now, in considering any strategy for the institutionalization of adult education as a program of academic study, we must deal with three important factors in our planning: one is the institution itself, the other is the performing teacher, and the third is the client or adult for whom the entire effort is intended; all these have their respective needs and goals which must be respected and implemented.

At this conference, we are primarily concerned with the first (institution) and last (client) of these factors and only incidentally with the second (teacher). More specifically, in your role as administrators, you are compelled to react to the thrust of this conference as representatives of your institutions as a whole. At the same time, however, while representatives of our client - the adult, are not here, we must deal with him in absentia, for without him and without a knowledge of his needs, dispositions, abilities and motivation, any program designed to serve his development is certain to fail. It is to the client or adult as a potential learner that I wish to direct the remainder of my presentation. First, I will deal with the present state of of our knowledge about the adult's potential for learning and, second, I will discuss more specifically the process of adult learning itself.

Changes in Intelligence (The Ability to Learn) with Age

In general, there have been two kinds of data employed to deal with this issue, one is cross sectional and the other longitudinal in character. The cross sectional kind studies a random number of persons in different groups at successive age levels while the other studies the same persons over various intervals of time. The first of the cross sectional type was reported by Thorndike in his classic volume on Adult Learning. In brief, he studied the rate of learning over time, and, from his data, derived his famous age curve of learning ability with a peak at 22 and a decline of about 1 per cent a year to age 50. A somewhat later investigation by Jones and Conrad of about 1,200 persons ranging from 10 to 60 years of age in several New England villages yielded similar results. They showed a steady rise in intelligence from 10 to 21, followed by a decline in each of the subsequent age groups.

Yet again and later, Wechsler in his standardization of the Bellevue Intelligence scale in 1935, showed a high point in performance for his subjects at 22, followed by a gradual decline. Wechsler's data are particularly pertinent since they were derived from the use of an instrument especially designed to measure adult intelligence. Thus, from the cross sectional studies, we get a picture of intelligence peaking in the early twenties with performance gradually diminishing thereafter.

But the longitudinal studies, most of which have been conducted since those cited above, have revealed a somewhat different and more optimistic situation. Beginning with studies at mid adulthood of change in learning ability with age, it is interesting to note the outcome of a follow-up of the famous investigation of gifted children conducted by Terman at Stanford University. On one occasion, Terman and Oden, and on another, Oden and Bayley were able to locate and retest a number of the original sample, who by the time of the later inquiry were in the middle years of adulthood. In general, the results of both investigations revealed a gain in each of four age groups on tests constituting measures of conceptual thinking.

Turning to a study embracing an even wider interval of time, Owens has reported data particularly relevant for our problem. In 1950, when his subjects were about 50, he retested a group of college graduates who had originally taken the same test (Army Alpha) as freshmen at Iowa State College. About 11 years later, when his subjects were 61, he administered the same test a second time. Thus, there were two follow-up administrations of the same test to the same persons - the first after an interval of about 32 years and the second after an additional interval of about 11 years. At 50, the subjects showed a slight gain over their performance as freshmen, and at 61, in general they maintained the level they had attained at 50, with a decline only in tests of numerical ability.

Support for the Owen's picture of the mental ability of adults over 50 is reported by Eisdorfer who after a three year interval, found little change in the performance of 165 adults on the full scale WAIS, and by Duncan and Barrett whose research yielded similar outcomes with 28 men after a ten-year interval.

What is the meaning of this apparent discrepancy in the results of cross sectional and longitudinal types of studies?

In attempting to answer this question, Lorge, a student of Thorndike, made a distinction between speed or rate of response on the one hand, and power of response on the other. He noted that as persons move through the adult years, there is a decline in the speed of their reaction. But he was quick to point out that this did not necessarily signify a parallel decline in the power to react. By using tests of power under timed and untimed conditions, he conducted a series of investigations that tended to confirm his theory.

Others have objected to the results of the horizontal studies on the ground that tests of intelligence and learning are biased in favor of youth. Young people have usually had more experience in taking tests than older persons and their contact with the material in the test items is more recent and hence more available.

Finally, perhaps the most serious objection, relates to the criterion problem. What is a good criterion with which to correlate measures of adult intelligence? Is it academic achievement, a dimension often used in the validation of intelligence tests? Probably not, but if effective performance in coping with the stresses and requirements of the adult years is a criterion, and if this could be measured, we might come out with a different view of the structure and growth of adult intelligence. The criterion problem is one of the most difficult to resolve in the whole arena of psychological inquiry. It permits no easy answer, but it raises issues so fundamental that when related to the measurement of adult intelligence the problem of either its decline or increase must be viewed in a different perspective.

But to this writer, the most significant point to be derived from cross sectional investigations stems from two kinds of related data. One is the diminishing scores of successively older groups of adults and the other is that in the 1955 standardization of his scale of adult intelligence, Wechsler reports a five year advance in peak ability.

To elaborate: in the case of the first point, it is well known that older persons have had lesser amounts of formal education than younger persons and that amounts of formal education gradually decline as the age of the study population gradually increases. It appears, therefore, that the peaking of ability in the early twenties revealed by cross sectional investigations and gradual decline thereafter is just as likely to reflect a decline in amounts of formal education achieved by adults as it does a decline in adult ability to learn.

The five year increase in peak ability reported by Wechsler would tend to support the same point. Because in the 16 year period between 1939 and 1955, the educational level of the general population increased substantially, and at the same time, advances in availability and useage of the mass media, i.e. radio, TV and the printed page were equally substantial. Thus, the general environment became more stimulating and educative. This interpretation of the outcomes of cross sectional investigations, combined with the results of longitudinal studies showing no decline, give further support to the viewpoint that the conventional view that changes in the adult years inevitably bring about a decline in intelligence (or the ability to learn), can now be challenged by a growing body of respectable empirical data, and the three phase model of growth, on consolidation and decline as descriptive of the adult potential must be thoroughly overhauled and restated with a more optimistic stance.

But, there are other grounds for believing that the adult potential has been underestimated.

Role and Self Concept Theory

In the prevailing view of society, it is the major task of children and youth to go to school, study and learn and the major task of the adult to get a job and work. In brief, childhood and youth are times for learning and adulthood, a time for working. This is beginning to change, but the dominant thrust of society's expectation and equally of his self expectations, is that for an adult, the learning role is not a major element in his repertoire of living. Thus, both society and the adult view himself as a nonlearner. Our theory is that this failure to internalize the learner role as a central feature of the self is a substantial restraint in the adult's realization of his learning potential. Or more positively stated, if and when an adult thinks that studying, learning and the intellectual adventure is as much a part of life as his occupation and obligation to his family, he will be much more likely to achieve a higher level of intellectual performance. Briefly, it is proposed that the potential is there but it needs self and societal support to bring the potential to fruitation.

Sense of Discovery

Similarly, it may be argued that another disposition, namely a sense of discovery, tends to be lost in the adult years and if recovered, retained, and cultivated, would contribute greatly to intellectual performance.

A brief examination of what happens with the passing years will lend plausibility to this hypothesis.

We are on safe grounds for holding that about 15 months of age, when a child's ego is beginning to shape, most of an individual's waking hours are devoted to discovering the exciting world about him. Everything is new and everything literally from the ground up must be learned. There are unending mysteries to unravel, new tasks to be mastered and new frontiers to be explored. But, as the strange becomes more familiar, and as skills become habitual, the sense of discovery begins to recede. This becomes increasingly true as one approaches adulthood and as the skills and activities required for the major responsibilities of living are mastered. Here discovery gradually gives way to repetition, and acquisitions to maintenance. There is nothing essentially reprehensible about this. In fact, a certain amount of habituation is necessary, and in most enterprises, effective maintenance is as essential as the original process of building.

It certainly would not be efficient for example, if we as adults had to devote as much time and attention to learning to tie our shoes, learning to read and write, or even drive a car, as children and youth must learn to do. The world of dressing up, of becoming literate, etc., must become as efficient and habitual as possible in order that these skills may be instruments for better things. So, a naive belief in the wonders of discovery could easily lead us into a primitive kind of romanticism utterly unrealistic for the exigencies of adult living.

But typically for most adults, the efficient performance of maintenance activities does not release a person to continue the adventure of discovery. Instead, following the Law of Least Effort, he tends to take the convenient road of repetition, gets into a rut and appears gradually to lose his ability to cope with the intellectual demands of his world. But there is nothing inevitable in the order of things that this should occur. It is the intent of our theory that the loss of the sense of discovery is a reflection of a condition in which an adult allows the requirements for maintenance to over-ride his needs for the pursuit of inquiry and not a reflection of an absolute decline in ability. More positively, it is also the intent of our theory, that a sense of frontiersmanship can be cultivated and restored, that the adventure and wonder of life can be renewed, if not increased. If to his self expectation as a continuing learner, an adult could add a picture of himself as one continuing to discover, he could heighten his ability to learn and inquire, for here the Law of

Use would overcome the Law of Disuse, and the thrust of his inquiry would be reinforced by the cumulative satisfactions resulting from his constant probe of the edge of the unknown. What better validation of the preceding hypothesis could there be than the common experience that as one advances in years and learns more and more about the world about him, the more he realizes how little he really knows and that a vast terrain of the yet to be discovered remains to be explored.

In brief then, in our discussion of the adult's role as a nonlearner and his loss of a sense of discovery, we have argued that it is the moribund condition that he (the adult) often allows to encircle him and not a decline in absolute capability that accounts for an apparent decline in learning and in participation in intellectual activities. It is the adult condition and not the irreversible loss of ability which feeds the conventional view that aptitude diminishes with the passing years. The potential is there. If we reverse the condition blocking the potential the reality will appear.

In the first part of our discussion, we have been arguing that the trend of both empirical and theoretical evidence supports the view that adults have a potential for continuing learning which conventional wisdom has failed to recognize. Ours then is a stance of unrealized potential and not one of 'de facto' limitation.

The Process of Adult Learning

Variations on the S-O-R Formula

Next, let us look at the process of adult learning.

To learn is to change and the scheme most commonly proposed for explaining how learning-change takes place is the S(stimulus), R(response) formula or some variation thereof.

Historically, the S-R formula is essentially a more recent version of antecedent association or connectionist theories of learning. According to this view, learning occurs if we can associate or connect a new stimulus to an earlier response, or a new response to a former stimulus. In either case, some change occurs. This focus on relatively objective stimulus-response units of behavior provided the conceptual framework for bringing the processes of learning out into the open where they could be measured, presumably predicted and controlled. The presumption of the original S-R formula was that if we could account for and measure the stimulus, like the impact of a cue on a billiard ball, we could predict the magnitude and direction of the response. Or, if we knew enough about the response we could retroactively reconstruct the characteristics of the stimulus which was originally responsible for its arousal.

The S-R scheme works fairly well as long as learning is confined to simple kinds of learning. But it encounters severe difficulties when learning is more complex and the learner more mature. Consequently, it is a much better explanation of the quasi-mechanical learning of early childhood than it is of the more complex learning of the adult years. The difficulty lies chiefly in the fact that the raw physical properties of the stimuli are not sufficient to account for the individual differences in response. Something more called the 'intervening variable' is required and in terms of our formula, the intervening variable is the O, i.e. the person on whom the stimulus impinges and to which the person responds.

At this juncture in our argument it is necessary to draw on what we know about perception, for it is the role of perception which constitutes the empirical and theoretical basis for elevating the importance of the O in our formula and thereby stressing the unique importance of the adult condition as a decisive factor in adult learning and behavior.

We return to the point that it requires more than the raw physical properties of the stimulus to account for the R of the individual's response. More specifically, we begin with the reality that a person is immersed in an environment of incessant stimulation bombarding in varying degrees the sensory receptors (i.e. eyes, ears, nose, etc.). If unregulated, this all pervasive and constant bombardment could overwhelm and immobilize the individual. Fortunately, some of this stimulation is blocked out, while some filters through. Insight into the filtering process may be derived from awareness of the facts and theory of perception.

In the first place, perception is highly selective. That part of stimulation which finally becomes a part of experience, is NOT a random sample of what is totally available. There is (a) selective exposure and within the exposure field (b) selective awareness. That is we do not see, hear, etc., everything and we are not equally aware of everything we see, hear, etc.

In the second place, perception tends to be organized. A person perceives things in patterns that are meaningful to him. For example, note the influence of context (e.g. the Muller-Lyon illusion), figure and ground, grouping and closure. Gestalt psychology has been especially influential in calling attention to the crucial role of perceptual organization.

In the third place, both selection and organization, as well as the interpretation of what is perceived, are clearly influenced by the needs, disposition and set which a person brings to the perceptual experience. Experiments indicate that people are more likely to see an ambiguous picture as containing food objects when they are hungry than when they are satisfied. Other research reveals that college students interpret a picture anxiously when hypnotized in an anxious mood, critically in a critical mood, and positively in a positive mood. And in a classic experiment, Bruner and Postman demonstrated that in the case of ten year old boys the perception of the size of coins was directly related not to the size but the value (to the boys) of the coin.

Thus not the raw physical property of the stimulus but the individual's PERCEPTION of the stimulus is the key factor in determining the response. We cannot then predict (R) the response exclusively from our knowledge of the (S) stimulus. HENCE, I KNOW WHAT I SAY BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT YOU HEAR; I MAY KNOW WHAT I SHOW BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT YOU SEE.

The mistake of the original S-R formula has been its reductionist oversimplification of the highly complex nature of the learning process. By overemphasizing both stimulus and response, as well as their external character, it has reduced, if not ignored, the unique importance of the person (the intervening variable O) as the agent receiving and often originating the stimulus as well as the one giving the response. A more valid version requires the insertion of the O between the S and R thus reinstating the learner as an indispensible factor for understanding and influencing the learning process. The neglect of the person (O) as learner explains why telling (S) is not necessarily teaching and why listening (R) is not necessarily learning. Both Input (S) and Outcome (R) must be anchored in the person who is supposed to do the learning. This point is especially relevant in the adult years when experience becomes more and more cumulative and behavior increasingly differentiated.

In good teaching, therefore, all of this means that the instructor, the person responsible for the arrangement of the situation, has to be very sensitive to what is going where, and to get feedback which will help him regulate the interruption of stimuli. The learner, on the other hand, needs to be very sensitive to what the teacher is trying to do so that he can get the intent. Earlier, for example, you were having a nice little sparring session with Alton. You were trying to guess his goals, and he was trying to guess yours, and this was a beautiful example of constant interaction and feedback in order to get some cooperation as to what the goals really are. This type of thing goes on constantly in the classroom, and the teacher that does not see the necessity of feedback, keeping in touch and being sensitive to the tune, is not a good teacher in my judgment. The learner must be provided a situation whereby he can ask for cues, feel free to communicate, and respond without being frightened.

Question:

You mentioned something earlier about Federal funds available for adult education. Can you tell us for what this money can be used and how it can be allocated? I think there is a great deal of concern over this very aspect of funding for additional programs.

Response:

Optimism over HR 514 results from the fact that it has been in the making for over eight years. People in Congress finally got together and lifted the age of literacy to Grade 12 and, instead of just literacy, they are opening the gate to all forms of adult education. There is a very big hunk of money in the bill for people just like yourselves and state departments. My latest information is that the Congress authorized about $200,000,000 for this, but it is one thing to authorize and another thing to get the money. Where it is now I don't know, but I think the money that is active is ABE money. I think a lot of what I am talking about is hope based upon some very solid fact, namely, legislation and agreement. So I would say this money is not cash on the barrelhead. May I say in passing that ABE has survived cuts over and over again, as you probably know. And many other agencies in addition to the Office of Education are interested in ABE, welfare, etc. If I were in your place with the terrific responsibilities you have, I wouldn't start any programs on the basis of money that you don't have.

Question:

We are curious to know, since most of the adult learning curves you have cited have been predicated upon populations of Anglos, whether these adult learning curves still hold in terms of poor whites, Appalachians, poor blacks and poor urban, or in cases of severe cults of poverty is there a tendency for atrophy to set in after a certain length of time?

Response:

This is a good example of how wide open this field is for research. My, I wish we could turn some people loose to answer that question! Some of you have much better experience than I. One of you here said a person came to class and didn't have the ability to learn. I just don't know of any case like that. It is very possible, however, that in the self-selective process the only people who show up are the folks who have the ability to learn. The person who does not have the ability to learn doesn't show. Maybe these are anecdotal cases, but you get these fantastic stories of the black lady who is 100 years old, or the 73 year old who join adult education classes for the first time.

As a psychologist I would make this point. The very fact that a person has been able to survive in a very, very low order environment, regardless of his literacy or computational level and his ability to write, is itself a proof of some kind of ability. Here's your criterion problem: Let's say you were abandoned on an island and you still survived, the very fact of survival is proof that you have some coping ability. It is certainly adjustmental ability.

I would say again that the whole drift of theory and research is that "there is more gold in them thar hills" than wisdom and the impatience of the smug little classes has been inclined to believe. I think there is evidence on the side of the hypothesis that they can learn. For example, I would like to ask that question of Rene Gasselway. She lived with them, slept in bed with the kids with uresis, bedwetting, and the whole works. Some old patriarch had a severe case of TB; let the nurse describe it. Talk about culture shock -- you don't have to go to the heart of Africa, or Australia and the bush. I would have loved to say, "Rene, is it your impression that these folks, through disuse, through a very low stimulating environment, are incapable?" I am inclined to think she would have said, "No." You see, television is coming through, radio is coming through. There is now much more communication with the outside world than we realize. I would say the weight is in favor of learning. The whole drift of research indicates, you see, that the populations we said could not learn have actually shown they can -- the mentally retarded, the handicapped, the spastics -- special education is full of it.

Question:

What can we do in adult education to nurture creativity? What kinds of psychological techniques can be applied to strengthen the creative facilities and faculties of our students.

Response:

One of the last things done at the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults , which now headquarters at Syracuse University, was a nice little pamphlet on this very topic. You can get a pretty good answer if you write to Roger DeCrow at Eric.

Question:

What we are talking about here is administrators going back to their institutions and developing faculty committees that struggle with these problems and the involvement process that almost unanimously takes place. You will get this kind of concern that will force them in their own minds, and they buy it themselves, to provide this kind of creativity in all fields within colleges of education -- not just the professors of adult education.

Response:

You have two populations here. One is the adult as a learner, the rank and file, and the other is your colleagues. I think in general the same problems exist. You have got to set some ground rules and help them to be free to make mistakes and be willing to tolerate a lot of crazy stuff such as brainstorming, with the hope that you get a nugget or two. You ought to have ground rules so that you don't go tearing off with crazy ideas -- just something that is worth doing. Practically everything I know about creativity would apply in this field. I have a theory, too, that if the adult could stay limber and flexible, his capacity for creativity ought to be greater for the simple reason he has got more stuff to be creative about.

Those discoveries, those kinds of principles that have terrific transfer value, are based in part upon the range of things that a person can put together. How, it is true that some poeple are in a rut. The range of some adults is very limited. But if they could live in such a way that their range could be increased, the longer you lived, the more stuff you would have to put together. I think this is what happens in very wise people like Toynbee and the great philosophers and other great people. Because they have this fantastic range, they have it all over a younger person. They have concepts, and this concept relates to that concept; and I don't care how fast the younger person can think, these people have gold in their long experience, and they can flash it together. It may take five times longer for them to incubate it, but when it is put together, they have something.

There is a lot of good apriori argument for the fact that if you have lived fairly well and have a pretty good capital of experience, and you keep in the habit of putting things together in new ways, so to speak, you could be very creative. There is nothing in the neurology of capacity that says you can't do that. It is the style of living, the style of thinking that matters. To illustrate, let's take the notes of a piano. You take those notes for three or four octaves and put them on separate slips of paper and then scramble them. You blindfold yourself and pick them out at random. The chances are that 15 sequences will be just hash, but it is very possible that the 16th could come up with something that you just never thought of before. Or let's assume that you come out with words and you put them on separate slips of paper, or letters -- that's how they got nonsense syllables -- and scramble them all up, or take ideas and do the same -- random force juxtaposition. What I am arguing for is a kind of limberness, a willingness to regroup experience. The theory is that if you had more to regroup and could still stay limber with a trial attitude, then you would be a bright person.

Question:

I think formal education tends to destroy creativity. We know, for example, that a truly creative person does not pursue higher education. People with doctorates are not creative in the sense of being creative artists. In developing an adult curriculum, it is necessary for us to remember that an essential component of the human psyche is creativity. As Suzy Weiss said yesterday, we ought not to standardize adult education.

Response:

I would agree with that. The trouble with my models and examples, and maybe yours too, is that we are talking about basically an elitest group. I would say that for a lot of people life can be more creative than it is. They can put together elements and do new things that from an outsider's point of view seem to be at a very simple level, but for them, it involves a little bit of discovery. It could be a new way to fix the inside of a house, or a new cooking recipe, and so on. I would say that the common everyday life is full of examples of doing things in fresh, new ways -- fresh to the people doing them, that is. It doesn't have to be the discovery of a new formula.

Question:

In sparsely populated states, what would be some efficient and effective processes for planning and possibly implementing a regional approach in the training program for adult education -- maybe using minority groups such as the American Indians as a target group.

Response:

I think that would get foundation money. I think foundations like big, cooperative ventures. Off-hand I would say, let each person pick out one element they can specialize in and which would contribute to the total. I also think it would call for lots of interaction of staff so that you get workshops, and each can learn from the other so that the experience and success of one can be fed into the experience and success of the other. On the other hand, you have duplication. Someone may say, "Well, we specialize in animal husbandry at Michigan State but still teach English," and English is also taught an Ann Arbor. So there are some things that you would probably do in concert.

One of the very fascinating things they are doing in Appalachia is a dialect study. Now I think if you had a nice, beautiful plan -- each one doing his own thing -- and then orchestrated the plan, you might succeed. Try out Rockefeller Brothers, and so on. If you can package it so that it will somehow contribute to some of our hard problems, it would be worth trying. In your section of the country, the community school idea seems to appeal to some of the folks. It fits in with the culture.

Question:

Some of us were intrigued by your connecting community development processes with adult education. We would like to hear more about that.

Response:

The Antigonisch movement in Nova Scota was an example. Ten years Father Cody was working with the local fishermen. They got the idea of cooperatives, and they completely transformed the economy. They used a very slow moving, patient, educative process. Now, there are many approaches to community development. As a matter of fact, the NUEA Division of Community Development is now in the process of writing a little monograph. We just met in Atlanta the other day, each one doing his own thing; and my thing happened to be the adult education approach. I think there is a terrific field here.

Every problem, you see, has a life history. The black problem is blowing up now. We put it under cover because we could not keep the people in the roral south and other parts of the country under control. But they migrated to the North, and all Hell is breaking loose. Nobody had the guts, the vision, or the motivation to move in early enough. If we had caught this in an earlier stage when it was possible to be more rational, a little more could have been done with it. We have evidence to show that in many instances this is true.

Lake Erie, they say, is dead. They also say that Lake Michigan will be dead in 20 years. Now, if Lake Erie is dea, why can't we move into Lake Michigan while it is still possible to exercise some control?

I have heard planning people say they didn't like a citizen participation idea after the building was up. Why don't they say, "Come and help us," when they are beginning to make the plans. This is what I call "Dewey's 4 Steps in Problem Solving the Rational Problem." Basically, it is a problem-solving process where you get maximum participation of your participators and influential people in the community and the key people of agencies that have the responsibility, and you get maximum rational input in the implementing process.

Let me give you a good example. We have a community discussion course which is about nin sessions, two hours per session, each session a week apart. We get forty community leaders together to commit themselves to nine sessions. The first three sessions are casing this thing -- what is our community? What do people think about us? What do we think of our community? What is the history of the community? What are the boundaries of our community? Where do we do our services, etc.? They get acquainted with one another, and about the third or fourth meeting they have a problem concensus. What are our resources to solve the problem? Then they divide along problem lines into three or four groups to study these problems, and they come back and make recommendations for actions to the total group. We have had fantastic results. I call that an educative approach.

John Osmond for the Brookings Institute in Washington does a fantastic job of very high level education -- literally a big superseminar of the creme de la creme of the power structure of the community, together with high powered materials and experts. He will come in and get these people to commit themselves for a year to talk about the Ohio Valley, Tempee, Arizona, or Alaska. He got the hundred legislators in Alaska to talk about what is going to happen with all the oil up there. I call this an educative approach.

Ten years ago, Romney, who was head of American Motors, became the head of the Detroit Citizens Committee on School Needs. We spent two years studying what Detroit needed. They had a bond issue which was turned down. Five committees at the central level on finance, buildings, curriculum, personnel, and community relations, for which I was the consultant, met and lived with the problem. There were nine subregions all over the city, each with similar committees. We had about every school building in Detroit cased from the gravel on the corner to the spire on the top of the building. About three thousand people reviewed the Samson Study: A Guide for the Study of School Buildings. All of this effort was voluntary, paid by gifts from the community. The results of this effort were compiled in 185 recommendations authorized by the Board of Education. In November, 1958, it was turned over to a campaign committee, including people who had developed the recommendations. They went into the campaign with a new committee and a new chairman, and there was 18 percent unemployment in Detroit in April. They passed a $90,000,000 bond issue and a higher new millage rate. A lot of people feel that if this had been perpetuated the riot in 1967 would not have occurred. I call this the educative approach.

I am not willing to leave the solution of our problems today to wiping the noses and taking care of the hoodlums after the riot. Maybe we can stand violence up to a certain point, but there is a point beyond which you can't. You get battle fatigue; you get repression.

Adult educators have some responsibility for using the problem solving process to help people control the situation before it gets too explosive. I think there is an adult education approach to community development, and the new Detroit Committee that came in that first year after the riot was in a sense an attempt to introduce some rationality into a very hot and explosive situation.

Question:

What are the psychological implications or the personal and social programs that will help build this kind of self-concept as opposed to programs that provide vocational orientation for pockets of people who have no employment opportunities?

Response:

You are talking about vocational training when there is no chance for a job?

Question:

Right.

Response:

Obviously, when you can promise a person some real, tangible job opportunities at the end of training, the motivation is greater. An example is training in industry where you take the hard core and actually train them on the job while the government is paying for them. Now, what you are going to do is motivate these people when there is no prospect and they don't see any, and this is very rough. My experience tells me that the thing you can do is set up the program so that you have contact with employers at the other end, or so the person is employed part-time and can phase into the job. All the evidence shows very clearly that if a person can see something very solid at the end of the road, you get much higher motivation. One lady, they said, was a wonderful person, a good cook, but not very literate. They trained her, and she suddenly became the chief cook in all the barges on the Mississippi River, earning $15,000 a year.

Comment:

The technological unemployment that is occurring will continue to occur. We are in a period where our economy is down. I think we have to be optimistic that the economy will recover, that we will get over this period of readjustment, and that we will move in the direction of more jobs rather than fewer. The man from Bell told me that in the next ten years the Bell System will hire 3,000,000 new employees. In order to do that, they will have to interview 30 million to retain 300,000 over a ten-year period. So there is an enormous amount of activity and potential employment, just with one employer.

I think Howard is on the right track when he says that it is the responsibility of adult education to work very closely with the unions and particularly industry to develop job potential. Let's prepare the people for what they need rather than for the old jobs that existed traditionally with the old equipment that we have as hand-me-downs from the old companies because they no longer use it.

Question:

We were fishing for some approaches that had been used in the Harlem-Kentucky area where there are third generations of unemployed. We are going into the same kind of thing with the Blacks in the agricultural area, the French in the Bijous, or the Anglos. Should they be prepared to become some of these 30,000,000 people seeking employment on the West Coast, or should we emphasize some kind of social skills?

Response:

I think you ought to be practical. What counts to the man is a job in which he feels fairly secure, has some cash, a sense of identity, and the other things that go along with it.

Comment by Charles Kozoll:

There are two things that I would like to bring to your attention in focusing on the sorts of responsibilities that you will have. One is a paper that was written by Charles F. O'Toole with the Systems Development Corporation in California.

His organization was asked to do a study of the types of educative goals that will be appearing in the 1980's, and in submitting this to the American Association of School Administrators in 1968 he cited a variety of educational goals for the educator facilitator systems planner. He gave them labels and described the sorts of things that are going to be required in education by 1980, and it gives you an idea as to what they are leaning toward.

A second area you might want to look at if you haven't done so already is a series of migration studies that emphasize the movements of Blacks and other undereducated people from various sections of the country, and the sorts of changes which occur in their lifestyles as a result of the migration. A lot of this has been done through the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Interior. There's an excellent bibliography that comes out of the University of Michigan on poverty which cites a lot of these studies that you may be familiar with. You can usually get them fairly inexpensively, and they talk about the sorts of things that are being done to assist individuals in moving from various sections of the country. I would recommend both of these to you.

Question:

In this group, representing the areas of Montana, the Dakotas, and Wyoming, we are concerned about different psychological approaches in trying to deal with the minorities and their subcultures. Do you have any suggestions as to how this can be approached in connection with training adult education teachers?

Response:

No. As I say, there is a pluralistic approach to the minority problem, and I think this is the thing to caucus about. Get inside their culture and inside the skin of the person. I could have almost clapped my hands when you said that in training one person out of the rest of them, everything breaks down. The poverty style is an entirely new lifestyle.

By the way, Tom Parsons who is now head at Humbolt State College in Northern California has done a fantastic job of converting the spoken language of the Indians to writing, and so on. This could be one approach.

Since time is going by, I would like to wind up on some of the exchanges going by here. What are the roles of the adult educator? Let's assume you set up a center for adult studies on your campus. What are the trends, the future? Adult educators today have to be future oriented. Three million new jobs, 30 million applicants: this is the kind of data we need to have constantly. We have got to be on top of it all the time -- all the way along the line. You know the fantastic statistics: half or two-thirds of the jobs that will be in existence in 1985 do not yet exist. We have to find the necessary skills. Let me give you a good example. I met a chap from Florida in the tobacco business who closed out and is now going into adult education. He is in the State Finance Department and said that he was very upset about people losing their jobs. He found that the skills of women with digital dexterity to wrap cigars could transfer to a lot of the very find movements required in some of the factory operations. I just give you this as an example of assessing skills to see how they can be related to new job opportunities. This is the reason why I pleaded with you a minute ago not to think too much in terms of the past, but in terms of the future. You have never had a better chance to be creative.

What is the significance of the General Motors strike other than making cars cost more? One of the key things on which Woodcock almost lost his following was 30 and out, and the big drive for 30 and out was for the young men in the 20 to 30 to 35 age groups. If Walter Reuther had lived, I predict that within 5 to 10 to 15 years he would have built into the contract an allowance for education. This is in the air, my friends.

The other day I flipped through Business Week and saw an article about 60 to 65 thousand men from the Armed Forces, mainly officers, being turned back to the society between the ages of 40 and 55, ready for new careers. What does this mean, my friends? You are going to get great numbers of people coming out at 50 and 55. If half of what I say about adult potential is true, those people have got a lot to offer society, rather than just hunting deer in Northern Michigan. Society can't neglect them, nor can it neglect the great rank and file blue collar people who will get locked in at about 35 unless they refuel and renew themselves. Sometime the society will say, "We are going to make some of this leisure time count for learning."

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Paul V. Delker

Question:

Is your interest and concern limited to adult basic education, or to the whole field of adult education?

Response:

My interest is not limited to adult basic education. The only money which Congress has allocated for me to administer is for adult basic education. Professionally, I am interested in everything from adult basic to lifelong learning.

When I came to the Office of Education, I was the Director of the Community Services Continuing Education Program under Title I of the Higher Education Act. That program used to be a part of the Adult Education Division. Under the reorganization of last January, Community Services was moved to the Bureau of Higher Education.

Question:

Can you give some indication of the kind of support that will be available for teacher training in the area of adult basic education?

Response:

The Adult Education Act of 1966, as amended last April, supports a three-prong program. From your point of view, there are probably at least two separate programs. It is funded this current fiscal year at 55 million dollars, 45 million of that going to the state

---

Paul V. Delker received his undergraduate and graduate training at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana. He became Director of the Division of Adult Education, USOE, in July 1968 after serving for two years as Chief of the Community Services and Continuing Education Branch of the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, USOE. He has worked for VISTA, Peace Corps and has also been involved in supervisory development and educational programs in private industry.

departments of education for conducting adult basic education programs in the states. That money can be used, not only to fund classes in local school districts or community colleges, but also to do teacher training, research, and demonstration projects which are relevant to the state, as the state sees fit to spend it. The State Director of Adult Education has money, and in some states they experience difficulty in spending it by the end of the year, especially if the appropriation is particularly late. If the state laws will allow, a contract can be made between the state department and a college or university for demonstration, teacher training, or whatever is mutually arrived at by people such as yourselves and the state director. The other 10 million is divided between two authorities -- one ($3,000,000) is for teacher training, or more accurately we should call it personnel training. It is not limited to training teachers or teacher trainers, but includes training administrators and other personnel. The other ($7,000,000) is for special demonstration projects.

We are just finishing the revised guidelines, and within two to three weeks, if you are interested in submitting proposals under either or both of those authorities, we will be able to send you these new guidelines and a brief statement of priorities. The emphasis this year will be on teacher trainers and teachers, probably more so than in the past, as distinguished from administrators or guidance and counseling personnel.

Question:

We were told that there is a House Bill No. 514. Can you give us any information about it?

Response:

In April, Congress passed amendments which allow us now to include the high school level -- to change the target population from approximately 24 million adults who have not completed an eighth grade education to about 69 million adults who do not have a high school education. The 69 million is according to the 1970 census. At the same time, Congress said that we were not to go into high school completion until the basic educational needs of the state have been met. At least for this year, that's interpreted to mean that we have to stay at the eighth grade level.

The amendments also changed the formula for allocating the funds to the states. The formula used to be $100,000 base to each state, and the balance distributed according to the percentage of people with less than a high school education. So you move from a distribution formula involving 13 million people to a formula involving 69 million people.

Obviously, this moves us much more in the direction of a general population distribution. The result is that 17 states, principally in the South and Southwest take a beating, some losing as much as a million dollars from what they would receive under the other plan. So we petitioned through the Secretary of HEW to ask the Congress to pass a technical amendment that will allow us to use the old formula for this year only, and next year have the new formula take effect. The reason for that strategy is that our appropriation request was submitted under the old legislation. It had to be because that was the law of the land at the time.

So the 55 million dollars were requested on the basis of the old formula, not on the basis of the twelfth grade limitation. The new formula will allow the people in the field and hopefully the administration to make a case for a much higher appropriation next year. And a higher appropriation, if it is high enough, would offset the changes to the states in the changed formula.

Question:

Does the technical amendment also change the 5 percent?

Response:

Yes, it does. The 5 percent administrative limitation in the new amendment is probably the most misunderstood part of the amendment. There is a restriction that only 5 percent of the allocation can be used for administering the Act in the state. That 5 percent is 5 percent of the total 55 million dollar allocation; and 5 percent of 55 million is 2.75 million. In 1969, the states reported approximately 3 million used for administration.

Question:

Dr. Howard McClusky was here this morning talking basically about the future. There are a number of persons in the room that were at the Commission of Professors meeting in Atlanta; and you read a paper regarding how you looked at the future. Could you sketch that very briefly for this group?

Response:

Basically, I would like to hit two points. First, what is the problem or the challenge to adult education between now and 1980? Secondly, what is the solution to it?

We take off from the Right-to-Read Program that gives us as a national goal the elimination of illiteracy by 1980. First you ask, what does that mean? How do you know if you have eliminated illiteracy by 1980? We know all children who complete school are not able to read at the adult level. But what about the adults who are already out of school, and those that will come out of school without achieving that goal between now and 1980? What we really have to come up with is a new definition of functional illiteracy.

One of the articles which you have is a reprint from the Harvard Education Review; it is an article by David Harmon of Harvard. David did a sample on reading skills, with materials that we would all agree adults ought to be able to cope with in our society. These materials include application blanks from various industries, driver training manuals from different states, census forms, and other things. Then he said, "Computer, computer, on the wall, tell me at what level you have to read in order to handle this material," and it's answer was: tenth grade or better. He then threw the IRS tax forms in and it said twelfth grade or better; and I know you're all going to say "better." Taking the 1970 Census data, he came out with the figure of 69 million adults, which in 1970 is over half the adult population. He makes the rather startling statement that half of the adults in this country may be functionally illiterate.

Now, let us look at what the Louis Harris and Associates survey has done for the National Reading Council. Using simplified reading materials, they wanted to know how many illiterate people we had. They came out with 18-1/2 million, even with the simplified reading approach.

The two studies are substantially in agreement. It's the different approaches that give you different figures. What this says is that if we are really going to reach the goal by 1980, we have to get an accurate, updated definition of functional illiteracy.

Our office is looking toward funding within the next thirty days of a project to create what we call the Adult Performance Level. This is made up of four components, one of which Harmon begins to identify in his study -- the adult reading level. What kind of reading skills must an adult have to function in our society -- not just to survive, but to participate fully in society -- in the economic, social, cultural, educational worlds of today. The second component is the adult writing level. What must an adult be able to do in the way of penmanship and writing, other than sign a check. Third is the adult computational level. It would appear to me to require a minimum of adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing, fractions, and decimals. Fourth, and the toughest area of all, is what we are calling general knowledge variables. In other words, what content areas must you know in our society in order to function? Some people might call them coping skills, or life skills. But our definition includes everything from how to get a meter hooked up in your house to using the yellow pages, to finding your way around the city, to being able to learn about candidates, and so on.

We will be funding a project, therefore, I hope within 30 days, which will in effect give us a definition of functional illiteracy, and define the adult performance level for our society. This will become the goal of adult basic education. We will eliminate the grade equivalents that we are accustomed to. High School equivalency is apparently somewhere close to what the Adult Performance Level would be in the first three areas: reading, writing, and computational skills; whether it is adequate in the general knowledge skills I think is certainly in question. Once we get that, it will give me a new resource.

Of course, I'm only one administrator of adult basic education programs, and there are 28 different adult education programs in the federal government. All these programs could have basic education components for adults. They may not be adult basic education in the exact sense that the Adult Education Act of 1966 approaches it, but they are programs like "Project 100,000", Department of Defense, the Basic Education Authority on the Manpower Development and Training Act, the authority which the Office of Economic Opportunity has, and many others.

Question:

Do you see that the community colleges, of which there are now well over a thousand in the nation, as having a role in the training of teachers in adult basic education?

Response:

Yes. However, it is not clear to me what this role is or what it will involve. I see it most clearly in relation to developing paraprofessionals. It seems to me that a lot of hang-ups relating to the disadvantaged are overcome by having the community college as a delivery system. There are many in the field whose judgment I value, but I think it is an expensive way to reach the disadvantaged population. That hasn't been researched, but it is easy to defend, given the overhead and higher salary structure. Whether or not it is more effective in terms of cost effectiveness has yet to be researched. I think the community colleges have their hands full. Most of them are straining from too rapid expansion, so I have some reluctance about how urgently to call them to this mission. But I do think they have a role; there is no question about it.

Question:

I guess part of the answer to this question would depend on what kind of qualifications, experience, background, and so forth, we see teachers of ABE having.

Response:

If we seek teachers of ABE as fully professional K-12 teachers or beyond, then obviously the community college would have a very small role to play. On the other hand, if we see at least some of these teachers or supporting personnel as being at the paraprofessional level, then I say that the community college would have a lot to do with it. Until you get full-time teachers in adult education, you are not going to have as effective a system as we know how to have; and 80 percent of our teachers are moonlighting. They are in the secondary and elementary systems, and they are doing this Saturdays, evenings, or both. You have to develop pretty sophisticated capability for them to have the right kind of "on-and-off switch" to move from elementary to adult; and that's a real teacher training challenge in my judgment. I would rather create the full-time teachers and administrators to assume responsibility.

Question:

Do you see teachers of ABE being educated at the undergraduate level? In other words, do you feel that people that young would be successful in relating to under-privileged adults and this sort of thing?

Response:

If we simply add another set of courses to the catalog, I don't think so. Jack Mezirow has some pretty impressive data indicating it is a much more expensive operation to reach the hard core than the sixth grade reader adult. He progresses at a much more rapid rate, he is much cheaper to reach, much easier to recruit, and easier to retain. So it depends on what cut of population you are going to take.

Question:

What kinds of programs, if any, are being undertaken to curtail the source of the kinds of problems we are experiencing in adult basic education?

Response:

The analogy of the pool and the flow has been used, and the adult program is trying to bail out the pool, and there are times when probably the flow into the pool is at a higher rate than we are bailing. Of course, this means the elementary and secondary system.

In the Right-to-Read Program, they have already let a research contract with Educational Testing Service. The task of the research is to identify a set of reading paths by which a normal ten-year-old child can be predicted to be an adult reader by the time he graduates from high school.

The dropout rate is going down. But when you see the studies on New York and Chicago, the study that as much as one-half of the high school graduates are functionally illiterate and reading at the fifth grade level or lower, I happen to think that we are probably not bailing the pool as fast as the water is running into it. It is being attacked from both sides of the system, and that is the ultimate solution.

The beauty of being in continuing education is that you can't possibly work yourself out of job. If the system is graduating people who are all at one level, then soon we will work with the next higher level in continuing education.

Question:

Very early you talked about money coming from state directors. Is this through governors?

Response:

The state departments of education.

Question:

Is it involved in any way with on-going assistance to federally funded programs?

Response:

In the state department of education in every state, there is a man who carries one title or another, the title meaning "State Director of Adult Education." The state administrative office gets the money we are talking about. Now, in most states, the money goes from there to local school districts to run programs. In many of the states, they take some of it and have ongoing training programs for their teachers, and some of them have evaluation studies, and a few of them have these development demonstration efforts.

Question:

How realistic is it to really expect or hope that we'll really do something toward an eradication of illiteracy; or are we going to play political games with these people that we have been playing political games with for a good long time?

Response:

I think it is possible to eradicate illiteracy, but I don't know if we will. There is a voluntary task force that got together as of January of last year on how we could do this. One of the members of the task force reflected that he was a member of the first group that issued the first dramatic statement on damage to the ecology about ten years ago. We in turn reflected on that and said, "Well, it seems to take about 10 years to develop a national awareness." We are going to see a dramatic increase in the funds in the 80's going toward cleaning up the environment. It took about ten years to develop that national awareness. We are a good five years into that awareness lead-time in adult education, and I think that the Right-to-Read Program is a real breakthrough. The President sponsored the program. All we have to do now is exploit it in the best sense of the word. I am a realist about what it takes to move this society, and I mean this from a political standpoint as much as I do from an educational standpoint. The National Reading Council is a new resource. The Harris survey is saying the same thing that I am trying to say in the adult education area. So I think it's a real opportunity, and whether or not we make it is up to fellows like me and others who are in charge of federal programs, and I think it's up to people like you.

Question:

Is there any requirement that each state develop its own plan as to how it will establish its ABE program, priority, guidelines, and so forth?

Response:

The revised regulations will be coming out in a few weeks. Plans will have to be revised in relation to the amendments that I referred to; the amendments will require an annual plan. The previous regulations have not required an annual plan. In the past, they have required that a plan be submitted which would be in effect until that plan was amended. So the answer is no, it has not been required, but it will be required in the near future.

Question:

What kinds of requirements are there for input from people outside the state departments of public instruction?

Response:

The amendments that were passed in April did require state advisory councils when the bill was originally introduced, but that was taken out when it got to The House. However, we encourage it. One of the things that HEW is doing right now is looking at all of its state-manned programs. It has a Federal Agency Streamlining Task Force (FAST), and I've learned some things in working with the task force on our program. It is not realistic to require a state plan which is more sophisticated than the planning system of the state itself. I think that is really the problem we are identifying. A very few of our states have a sophisticated planning system. If there is one, it comes out of the governor's office. If there isn't, you have to design your state plan requirements within the known competencies of the people you are funding, and that isn't very impressive when you have just one person in the state who has to do a lot of other things too.

DEVELOPING A THEORY OF ADULT TEACHING

Jack Mezirow

It is a pleasure to have a chance to chat with you this afternoon. Since you are a group of university and college administrators and deans of education, becoming more oriented towards work in adult education and particularly basic adult education, I think that it might be interesting for you to get an idea of some of the things that the toilers in the vineyards are doing. I will put myself up as an example.

Actually, our interest at Teachers College began with a desire to do something constructive in the area of adult basic education. We looked the field over carefully, and came to the conclusion that it was suffering from the kind of problem that every new large scale program suffers from, and one not given to easy treatment. It had been a source of concern to many of us--and I suspect that some of you share it--how little educational research has contributed to influencing decision-making in practice and policy. I went through a long period of trying to understand why. I come from a background, I might add, as an administrator, a practitioner of adult education, so I was keenly aware of the limitations that I had felt in trying to relate to what seemed a not terribly useful body of research literature.

As we got into an analysis of how research findings had or had not contributed to program development, it became apparent that the kind of research being done fell into one of several familiar categories in terms of its limitations.

What you have in a program like ABE or any other large scale program is a complex set of factors going on as a process

---

Jack D. Mezirow, Ed.D., University of California at Los Angeles, is currently Associate Professor of Adult Education at Columbia Teachers College, New York City. In addition to teaching a number of graduate courses in adult education and community development, he is also the Director of the ABE Project described in the above speech. He worked with AID for several years in adult education and community development. He has also received a number of grants and published extensively in those same areas.

over time in many places. And one of the real problems is how you capture the reality in a description sufficiently good to warrant your making decisions about it.

The research very often seemed to only deal with correlates of behavior - attitudes, values, or social roles, cultural expectations, group norms or psychological organization and psychological processes. Now these all may be initiating factors influencing behavior. Nobody questions that too seriously. But the implication of causation is very strong in social science studies - if we just know enough about all these things, we would know about how behavior changes in people.

And as we looked over that assumption it seemed basically in error. As George Herbert Mead, Dewey, and a number of other people observed (the observation seems to have gotten lost in the social sciences over the years), is that meanings are not implied in things or ideas or ideals independent of people. People construct meanings as they interact with other people, largely on the basis of how others react towards an object or idea. Obviously, central to the educational process is how individuals construct meanings. But in studying correlates of behavior, this tended to get lost, so that we know a lot about values and attitudes and motives and psychological processes and cultural norms and expectations and group norms, but little about how a person goes about constructing meaning in the context of social interaction.

As we tried to relate this focus to a large scale national program, like ABE, it became apparent that not only would it be necessary to understand social interaction but that three dimensions were involved.

The first and most obvious is program organization and structural dynamics--the kind of information that tells you how a program is organized, who reports to whom, how they recruit people, and how they go about conducting business. However, whether that program succeeds or fails, whether it moves forward slowly or doesn't move forward, or whether it changes or doesn't change--is largely a function of how people are interacting within it. Its norms as a system or organization, are subject to change as a result of the social interaction of the actors who are a part of its ongoing activity. So we also wanted to study social interaction to better understand how the program is organized and operates. And then finally, to understand social interaction, we felt it essential to try to see it through the eyes of the participants, the people who are involved in the program. We focused on the teacher and the students: how they saw the program, how they saw other people in it, each other, what was in it for them, and how generally they read the signs--the incentives, and implied punishments. Until we could get that from their own eyes, how they viewed the program, all we really would be doing is going back looking for correlates of behavior again.

Our purpose was to try as definitively as possible to capture a normative description of the ABE program in the three aforementioned dimensions. We thought this was important because most research tends to be either so specific that you can't generalize from it in program terms, or so general that you really have difficulty using the results in any specific programmatic or policy sense. Therefore, if you had the full picture of what's going on including recurrent problems at all of the levels that I mentioned, you ought to be able to see where to put money to get answers for operationally relevant questions. You then have a frame of reference within which to map research priorities sequentially.

We thought if we could manage to capture a dependable picture of current practice, it would have other benefits. For example, by looking at commonalities, or modal patterns of program operation, classroom interaction and perspectives, you would be able to identify where problems are, where things were not going as they should be. Now, I am sure that most administrators recognize where many problems are, but their knowledge is of necessity fragmented and not based on scientific inquiry. So we thought that if we could establish where the problems were in this overall picture at each of these levels, it would be of considerable help to someone who is trying to judge how to improve the program operationally and at the level of policy formulation.

We also recognized that most teacher training isn't very satisfactory. For example, about the most useful finding 50 years of research on instruction has produced is that different people with different characteristics learn at different rates in different environments. Research hasn't been very useful in identifying what the variables are in improving performance. Yet, teachers are getting trained without the benefit of research. Essentially, they are getting trained with a set of principles, a set of theories, or in the state of the art as defined by folk wisdom. We felt that to find out what goes on in the classroom so that we could generalize with comfort about it, identify modalities of interaction and patterns of interaction that emerge, this itself would constitute an invaluable body of content for training teachers. You would then know what they are doing now. It seemed to us that the whole trouble in training teachers in ABE is that nobody knows what is happening now so that next step changes that we ought to brain for can be identified. I know better than you the kind of cliches that adult educators toss at each other about methodology. I can tell you that there is need for some of this kind of reality testing and strategies of next-step improvements in adult teacher education.

A final benefit we looked for was in program evaluation. It seemed to us that a normative description of this on-going complicated, many-dimensional reality that makes up ABE would add an essential qualitative dimension to studies of program output and explain the "why" of the "how much, how well and how fast."

Colleagues in four universities cooperated in this project, Teachers College, California, Michigan, and Northeastern University. We decided to do a study in six cities. These included San Jose, San Francisco, Detroit, New York, Boston, and Washington, D.C. A team from Columbia went to each of these cities with extended structured interviews of ABE officials and their staffs. We had over 105 interviews, and each one of them was at least an hour in duration. At this point, we were focusing on the first dimension--the structural and functional dynamics of the program--the kind of material you typically get in a report by a consultant. Subsequently, in five cities we took a representative sample of 59 ABE classes and attached a team of participant observers to those classes for a period of 8 months. These people, there were 12 of them at one time, were not experts. They didn't know anything about adult education and had no previous involvement in the field so far as I know. They were graduate sociology students, trained as participant observers, and they reported to a professor of sociology in each place who also had very limited prior involvement with this program or any adult education program. The observers were instructed to go in with no preconceived theories. We deliberately chose them because we didn't want them burdened with a hypothesis that they were going to check out or to see what they knew. We wanted instead to know through them what they saw. Every two weeks they would prepare field notes, acting in a sense as a tape recorder and a camera.

We then had a panel of analysts, people with extensive experience in analyzing field notes, and some others whom we thought were very good and knew a great deal about adult basic education. They would go independently and collaboratively through these notes every two weeks and look for commonalities. For instance, someone would say, "Here are two or three reports that suggest that the aides seem to get along better with the teacher in the classroom if the aide is locally recruited or comes from the local community where the class is located." Then we got in touch with our other people in the field and asked them to check this out. They would come back and say, "Yes, yes, yes, it seems to pertain." One man, however, would say, "Yes, it pertains, but there appears to be a mediating factor. It is true that if the aide comes from a local community a good relationship develops, but is appears even more important that the aide is of a certain age group in relationship to the teacher." And so we would go back in the field to the other people to check that out. They would then come back and somebody else would say "That's true, but there seems to be another thing . . . ." We kept building this way to generate such data out of the field experience.

We called this approach "synchronic induction" because we had to synchronize the inductive analyses with the data gathering by a lot of people at the same time. What the analysts looked for in these notes were emerging commonalities -- modal configurations of program activities, interaction, and perspectives of the people involved. And from this we adduced a set of generalizations. Then we told our field people, "You are now working in the field, you are acquainted with those classrooms, and you are to a degree accepted, so emphasize informal interviews and find out as much as you can about the point of view and the perspectives of the students and teachers." So they drank coffee and beer with the students and got acquainted in varying degrees during breaks and before and after class. They also talked at length to teachers. In all of the resulting data we again looked for the commonalities.

Methodologically, this was a distinctive way of doing social research in grounded theory. It has the particular advantage of overcoming the usual criticism in field work of subjectivity. By this method, the conventional criteria of reliability and validity are met. The generalizations that we made in describing and analyzing modal practices are tantamount to theoretical assertions, if you define theory as essentially a generalization that helps you understand and predict behavior. We felt we were building a theory of practice indigenous to ABE programs -- not borrowed from either adult education or elsewhere.

The report of our first year has seven sections -- the first describes the development of methodology. The second is an organizational model, a composite analytical description of the structure and functional dynamics of these six programs; it includes their setting, goals, staff, recruitment, sites, facilities, finance, materials, program development and counseling service. The third section is devoted to classroom interaction. It describes what goes on in the classroom in terms of attendance maintenance, rules and conventions, the organization of instruction, and it identifies three innovative patterns of instruction. It also deals with the mechanisms of teacher control, which is a distinctive thing in these classes. And it deals with an unusual ideology of minimizing failure and the mechanics of encouragement. Sections 4 and 5 describe students and teachers, respectively: their characteristics, motivations, and perspectives. In Section 6 we deal with the role and problems of the counselor in his relations with the teacher and students. Finally, we mapped out essential elements of a strategy of program development in the 23 implications for change in policy, administration, program, and staff development which you have in front of you. Some are quite highly specific. They essentially provide a map of "next step" actions in terms and policy and program from our perception of what really exists out there in the field.

Essentially, we found out some very interesting things, which are no great revelation, but which we hadn't known about before. For one thing, ESL--English as a Second Language--tended to be displacing basic education for native born adults. We discovered that very few hard core people were being touched by these programs -- only the most upwardly mobile among the illiterate target population were being served. We also ran into a great deal of ideological soul searching among ABE directors on the implications of this issue.

We also found that there is a different pattern of job aspiration -- a career pattern among this population different from that described in the sociological literature. Sociologists have usually thought of careers as hierarchical -- you go up if you have good luck, or anyway, you strive for the next level up. But people in ABE classes don't do that. A substantial proportion of them, and we have identified different subgroups, do not aspire to move up the hierarchical job ladder, but are concerned about finding a job that pays a little bit more, that has a little more freedom, that is a little easier on them, and with a little more security. There is little in the way of traditional career patterns among this particular population.

Another thing was the almost overwhelming influence of maintaining attendance and the need to keep it at a certain level. Attendance is a ubiquitous influence in the classroom, and there are ambiguities about why that is necessary. It has never been spelled out in policy terms that success, your survival as a teacher in the class, has to be related to numbers of people in the class. Yet this is the way the program gets administered, for reasons suggested in the report. It colors much of what goes on in the classroom, for instance, the teacher's attitude towards the students, what she does in the classroom, her attitudes toward the administration, and many other things. There is great need for clarification at every level of just what is the relationship between attendance and enrollment, and success in program terms. The basic education and ESL classes are totally different. They deal with different students, different teachers, different teaching problems, different patterns of interaction, and different motivation among the students. One is much easier to teach in than the other. The chance of success is much higher for ESL. The dropout rate is much greater in ABE, and there is great need in administrative terms to differentiate expectations for each of these programs. Those having the roughest time are being crowded out of the picture.

Let me just say in closing that the project has been extended for another year. We have identified some innovative program practices from our first year's data, and have set up a series of four comparative field studies to study factors facilitating and impeding their development and replication. Each field study involves six cities, so, for example, the University of California is studying six western cities, all of which have aides and volunteers in the classroom. On the East Coast, Northeastern University is studying learning labs and the use of full-time teachers in six cities. Michigan is studying contract programs in which the public schools contract with an employer and decentralized outreach classes. At Columbia we are studying the use of community liaison personnel in six cities.

In May we will conduct a series of four regional workshops for directors of urban ABE programs and professors of education concerned about training to share all of this data and get the input of their experience to further refine our normative description and analysis of the reality of these programs.

I might add that there was one recommendation in our report that pertained especially to universities. Essentially it called for universities to establish relationships with several local ABE systems to provide consultant help, program evaluation services, materials production, and a variety of other functions. It seems to me that there are a number of these things that just logically have to come out of universities if they have any adult educators in them. If you don't have an adult educator on your faculty, I'll be pleased to send you some very handsome doctoral students who are just completing their work at Teachers College. At any rate, let me plead for greater emphasis on qualitative analysis in your departments. There is a widespread movement to get students into the field where the action is. Their professors had better show them the way. Thank you.

Question:

In Point No. 5 of your paper, you talked about these several federally funded demonstration projects. Is this a threat to such existing programs as HELP, WIN, SER, Model Cities, and other programs? If so, how do we pull an educational program out of the arena of politics where it is now?

Response:

This recommendation has to do with reaching the hardest to reach student. I don't think any of these programs are really reaching the hard core, depending on your definition. Streetcorner people in the black ghettos, for instance, the kind that Elliot Liebow wrote about in Tally's Corner, the chronically unemployed, the most psychologically scarred, those who have failed consistently to support a family, hold a job, and do the things that normally give people identification and manhood. I don't think any of these programs are reaching them. I don't think they are interested. If you want an opinion that has no weight in terms of this research, I think that you have to get at these people in the context of a much broader integrated program. I am talking about programs that would provide all kinds of social services: special counseling help even bordering on therapy, a job, and continuing support. Training while they're earning is probably best. Yet, most employers aren't equipped to handle this kind of person. So I think the federal government ought to set up the jobs, the training and the counseling. We may even have to resort to some kind of religious appeal, because I don't know whether these people would respond to psychiatric treatment either. Whatever would reach and help them is what we should try. It seems to me there has to be a staging area. It's going to cost the Federal Government a lot of money, and it has to guarantee employment. The jobs are going to have to be for these people, not individuals who can fit into industry and business. I don't think industry and business are going to put up with it. I don't think they should be asked to. I don't think most of the existing federal programs do anything, and I believe such effort has to be funded separately. That is no argument against these programs. The total population of the group we are talking about is a very small proportion of the total illiterates. If I were in some state director's shoes, I would spend most of my budget the way they are spending it. For humanitarian and political reasons, it seems to me that some portion of it ought to be earmarked for work with the "hard core." What happens with that money should be judged by very different criteria of expectations from the regular program. I think the ABE program should continue. There are millions of people who can benefit. In it's target population, only about 10 or 15 percent would really be classified as hard core, the hardest to reach people. We keep running into directors who are very concerned about not reaching these people. We can't in this day and age ignore them. There is an argument in adult education whether you go where the need is the greatest or whether you go where the chance of maximizing service is the greatest. This is a continuing ideological struggle in all of these poverty related programs. I think the decision has been made, and probably rightly, given the strength of the public school system and the way this program has been set up, that the schools do what they can do best. They are servicing a lot of people. You just can't trade off the 10 or 15 percent, however, who need it the most for the 85 percent who need and can use it, have upwardly mobile values, want to succeed within the system, and can respond to a middle class program, which this essentially is.

Question:

You are saying that we should take the people who will respond. I agree, and I talked to NAPS and told them that if they had a company willing to provide 160 hours of basic education, they would have to identify people who will succeed in 160 hours, or we are putting them in another failure position. They say that they can't make such a selection because that would be discriminating.

Response:

The idea that in 160 hours you are going to take anybody in a heterogeneous population of illiterates and pull them in to be trained by people who don't know what they are doing is ridiculous. I get them all the time. They go around to the employers and say, "The Federal government will put up the money. You create some jobs. They can be dead-end jobs, or whatever. We'll help you write this proposal for the government. We'll do the training, and it won't cost you a cent. There are a lot of fringe benefits like training your supervisors, and so forth." Then sincere people come and say, "We don't really know about this. We haven't done this before, but we have been great elementary school teachers. We have been hired by this contractor to do the job." But they must do it in one hour per week over X number of weeks, and that's impossible adult education.

Question:

The company has to be committed too.

Response:

That's right, and if the company is committed, and if they can find a training organization that knows something about it, that's fine; but I don't think that's the general pattern. One of the things commonly found among people concerned with the "hard core" is that to really reach them, any conception of being a teacher has to go. Essentially it appears to require a degree of continuing, intimate, personal involvement that's less structured than that of an instructor. Essentially it is a friendship, and that implies a sense of mutual obligation, and in the culture we are talking about it becomes compelling, comprehensive, and demanding. Now, ABE teachers and teachers in most programs can't enter such a relationship and they don't. They don't get involved on this kind of an intensive personal basis. You'll find teachers who will take a student to a hospital if he is sick, even occasionally lend him money, and knows generally what is going on in his life. But the kind of commitment that I am talking about is a very real one. If you are going to work with these people you really have to get involved with them -- not as an instructor in any formal sense, but as a mentor, what the British used to call a "friend, philosopher and guide." There really has to be a different relationship, and I think this is impossible in the public schools.

Adult basic education teachers are mostly elementary school teachers who moonlight. They have other jobs. They have other commitments. They are good enough at what they do in ABE. I mean they're pretty good anyway -- they're not bad -- and most of them have the right attitude in terms of being empathetic, concerned, flexible and trying. Unfortunately, they don't use much in the way of adult education methods. They teach the way that elementary school was taught 20 years ago. They can't deeply get involved personally with the students. This requires a full-time job and certain sensitivities that some people have. The ABE program has funded some special demonstrations which have made a special effort to haul students off the streets, out of bars and, in one case, houses of prostitution. At least that is what they say. I really think that something like this is pretty important. You have to design a program that is very different -- without classes, taking people where they are and accepting their distinctive learning styles. I suspect that maybe something like the open classroom which is big in elementary education has some promise. Somebody has to come up with new patterns.

Question:

In the last observation in your recommendations, did you entertain the possibility that maybe you ought to consider attaching adult education to some institution other than the public school system?

Response:

Adult education programs are by no means restricted to public schools. Our study was confined to Title III programs. But ABE programs are conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by a variety of other sponsoring agencies, some of which have more flexibility. For instance, in one place we studied, the OEO pulled a class together, conducted it in their quarters, and the teacher was provided by Title III. They didn't like the Title III teacher, however, and they didn't like the certification requirement. So they worked out a very devious way of getting a teacher they wanted who wasn't certified to teach, and it was known and tacitly accepted by the public schools. So there is flexibility in practice, and there are innovative things going on. But it is here and there, and Title III does have its priorities and limitations.

Question:

You say you looked at organizational patterns, and the second variable was interaction. Presumably as you relate these two, one of the patterns of organization typically is the link with the public school system. Yet when you concluded, you did not say anything about whether or not that was a functional or disfunctional link to perpetuate.

Response:

We didn't really look at it as an option. I suppose the whole thing could be pulled out of school systems and done in another fashion. But that wouldn't be a terribly good idea. Schools do have some special resources and can do programs that I think couldn't be done on nearly the same scale by anybody else. It just seems that they should do what they can do, and others should be given the chance to do some other things. What usually happens is that under the superintendent there is a department of adult education responsible for everything up through high school -- the education of adults -- and within this department is a separate unit called ABE. Most of the time the ABE unit doesn't even include a full-time director. He is a part-time person. We did go into some considerable detail about the advantages and disadvantages we encountered in the way these people are recruited and put into those positions and some of the effects of doing so. It is certainly important.

Question:

Can you elaborate a bit more on your Item 23, which is probably one of the most crucial in the program?

Response:

There were several things about evaluation and the way it is done that I think are particularly disquieting. I really think it is almost a black art. Yet, it is given the cloak of respectability because it measures things and uses statistics, and what not. There are a number of specific things that are wrong which seem to me recurrent themes in the way programs are currently evaluated. Without benefit of data comparable to that we gathered, without a research-based comprehensive picture of the reality of this ongoing program--a normative description of the process of development of this program--evaluators are at a tremendous disadvantage. In the first place, qualitative factors are usually not covered systematically by the evaluator. Modal patterns of the critical qualitative components can be identified as benchmark criteria of performance.

One thing I didn't mention earlier about our study was that to make sure we were not generalizing on the basis of only six cities, we did a national questionnaire survey of all the directors of ABE programs in 124 cities of over 100,000 population. This was to test the validity of what we found, and we got back results that were very compatible with our field observations and analyses. Essentially, what we had said was true. We had mapped out qualitative factors that an evaluator ought to know -- norms that are qualitative as well as quantitative.

Without reliable benchmarks of this kind pertaining to program structure and operation, interaction, and the perspectives of people involved, the evaluator has to rely usually on his own limited experience gained in other educational programs, or which he gets from the literature or professional meetings. Not enough evaluators have been around to sufficient numbers of these programs to be able to comfortably generalize. I think we have been able to help them in this respect. Now at least they have something to build on.

Let's talk about objectives a minute. They are often terribly distorted by evaluators. This notion that you build the whole world of education on prestated objectives just seems to me ridiculous. What happens is that objectives are treated by educators like nothing except maybe biblical injunctions. An ideal, idea or hypothesis is tested against reality and modified according to what you find out reality is. Only program objectives get stated somewhere early in the game and are held as a constant against what you measure as reality. Now that seems to me a screwed up set of priorities. As you get into a program and move forward in it over a period of several years, you find what is possible and what is feasible. It seems to me those objectives have to be redefined to reflect this. If they aren't, they are something very different from anything else in the experience of scientific inquiry. I think that objectives should be viewed as processual, as evolving. There were constant changes in the three dimensions we looked at, and they couldn't be compared against any kind of external, predetermined criteria. Maybe the process ought to be reversed -- maybe we should measure whether objectives need to be changed on the basis of reality, and then determine the degree to which they have to be changed as an indication of progress. One of the things that does come out of this, it seems to me, is that change keeps evolving in all of these dimensions over time to the point where original objectives simply are inadequate.

Paranthetically, I did a study of ABE programs in New Jersey with a group of students. We went in using field methods. I found, without stretching things a bit, 15 different, distinct perceptions of objectives for the same program as a result of talking to administrators, students, and everybody involved. Now, which ones are the legitimate ones? Those the proposal writer wrote? Because they were totally different from all the rest. At any rate, the evaluator should go in with a great deal more humility about stated objectives.

Another point is the effort to develop instruments for evaluating--you have to operationalize reality. Yet, reality is a big, complicated, evolving process. What is done is that someone abstracts a slice of that reality and develops an instrument trying to pin down its validity for the particular segment of time pulled out to be studied. I submit the approach we demonstrated, and our findings negate this as a legitimate way to do an evaluation. The idea that you can really judge a program on the basis of administering instruments I think is very questionable.

Those things you can measure become the objectives of the program, and they displace other objectives. Now, there is very little I can see in the enabling legislation, the guidelines, or even the state plans that establishes the priority consequences of this program in any particular order. Almost everybody acknowledges that there are coping skills, that health education, consumer education, voter education, etc. is a legitimate part of the package. Which should come first? The evaluators arbitrarily decide which consequences should come first to make somebody literate. I think the subject is open to question. In the first place, that decision should not be made arbitrarily as it now is by the evaluator. Secondly, what is almost always given priority in evaluation is the most measurable factors at the expense of other things. Peter Blau writes about the "physics of bureaucracy"--those objectives of a bureaucracy that are most amenable to objective measurement tending to displace the other ones. That has happened very much in the ABE program and a lot of others I know of.

Another thing I would mention is that most of these programs are preoccupied with program output. How, this output is not valid as a sole basis for judging these programs, because it completely ignores the development of organizational capability. The public schools, the universities, and nobody else really has the knowhow to do poverty-related adult education programs. They haven't developed it; they have never been given time and resources to develop it. What happens is that you go in and measure organizational or program output rather than what it takes to make an organization gear up to do its job. You end up cutting your throat. It may take two years for an organization to gear up with federal funds to do something, and then it may or may not be ready. They go through all this business of making institutional linkages, trying out and screening personnel, getting the space, the operational arrangements, reporting the budget, and all the rest. What happens is that some man blows in and says, "How many man hours of training were accomplished? Well, you didn't do enough, and the cost per day is outrageous." This is so stupid as to be almost a beggar comment. They cut the program off after two years when it is ready to move, and then they go someplace else where they can get a cheaper deal. What the federal government does is assume that existing institutions are equipped to handle anything. Yet, each of these programs make special demands, and universities don't have experts on ABE. Neither do public school systems, except those that may have developed in the last few years as a result of these programs.

What I think ought to be done is to put a resident guide into a lot of different places who would be attached as an observer for a long period over the program. I would then get a number of consultants to go in, look at what they consult, and get feedback from the observer and the ABE staff to see what they are missing. This should be done repeatedly and successively over time in different programs. Hopefully, we would then begin to come up with a set of guidelines so that an evaluator would know what to look for, how long it takes to find it, when to go in, and when not to go in.

Question:

I think you should add another objective to the program. You might require them to show you that they have modified their objectives to fit the reality of the situation.

Response.

That would be a great breakthrough -- if you could get somebody to buy it as an approach.

Question:

Should we try to eliminate those who are public school teachers now as teachers for future adult education programs?

Response:

I wish I knew the answer to that, but I really don't. There is no evidence that I know of which would clarify the issue. I can tell you with a great deal of assurance that these teachers follow a pattern of teaching in the classroom that is like elementary school used to be when you were in it. There is very little use of learning groups, which is sort of a standard adult education approach for reasons that I would be glad to go into. There is very little business of evoking from the student the kind of participation and involvement that would permit him to fit the concepts being communicated into his own life experience. There is a great deal of room for improving what goes on in the classroom. Whether that argues in favor of a different teacher or different training for existing teachers is open to question. We did identify in our report three distinctly innovative patterns in doing this kind of teaching, and each one looked pretty good and promising. Hopefully, Washington can be encouraged to set up some demonstrations to see for which students these work, under what circumstances, and what kinds of teachers you need. I am not at all convinced that the teachers should be certified at all. Maybe uncertified teachers would be better for some of this instructional work. The ESL situation is totally different than basic education, by the way. Even within those classifications, the basic education is usually on three levels, and it is the first one which has the greatest dropout rate. However, the program doesn't have many of those beginning classes in it. Most of the classes are intermediate or advanced -- 4 to 6 years or more -- and these students are able to adapt, they work hard, and they can learn. One of the real crunches comes at that lowest level, and maybe a different type of teacher ought to be recruited and put in there. Rather than asking whether they should be adult education trained as opposed to something else, maybe we should be asking, for what? It may even become necessary to differentiate just as you have among the minority communities that are involved in these programs -- different programs are prepared for different kinds of people in it. Maybe you should look at various types of teachers for different assignments within this program, and that would be something else again. Somebody could be given money to try it in different ways. This needs to be done because nobody has answers, and we may not even be asking the right questions.

Question:

Don't be reticent about those three innovative methods that work. Would you tell us more about them?

Response:

They aren't innovative to you, but they are innovative to this program. One of them is very common now. It is the learning lab, where there are self-instructional machines located in a place that is open usually all day and for many hours into the night, and where people come as they wish. The pattern is usually individualized instruction, although there are modifications in some places. A man comes in and meets a teacher or someone who sets out a program for him, and he follows that program for an hour at a time, or 20 minutes, or four hours next time. He uses a variety of machines that you may be familiar with for this kind of instruction. Usually the teacher, when needed, will come in and help the person with his problem. Experimental variations do exist, and there is reason to believe that many people like grouping in instruction, especially at that lowest level where there is the greatest dropout potential. Students at this level need group support. They can't go in and face up to themselves and machines, and a tutor who circulates and comes when they call him. I would be willing to guess, without supporting data, that for this group something different is going to have to work. But the learning lab is a way to individualize instruction, a way to stagger the demands made on anybody. There is almost no competition in such a setting except the student himself, which is the best kind.

We also discovered there is very little use of groups, and this is remarkable to me. Teachers either teach the students as a class and sometimes move in to teach individuals, or they only teach individuals and they never do anything else except give individual assignments and circulate around. We looked at how the teacher controls the class when these people can leave at the drop of a hat. There is no obvious control. The teacher has no leverage. You professors who work with students know there is some threat implicit in your relationship. But here is a case where the teacher really has no leverage over the students and, moreover, she has to keep attendance up because she is under great administrative pressure to do so. She can't afford to alienate these students in any sense, and many of them are very sensitive because they have been defeated over and over again.

The second innovative practice, then, is the use of groups. The teacher groups the students, letting each group do a different thing and at different levels. The outstanding characteristic of these classes is the incredible heterogeneity of the students. There has never been anything in American education like it! How would you like to face up to a class in which you had everything from a person who couldn't read and write, and a psychological mess, to a Ph.d. from Cuba, or somebody who has been a successful industrialist -- first and second generation Americans of every range of intelligence and psychiatric adjustment to people who are literally mentally retarded. You see, nearly everybody can be admitted to these programs. Particularly, we found there was a fairly substantial element of retarded students. What do you do? It's like a nightmare--like nothing else in education! Most of what you have to do is individualize instruction because you can't teach them as a class. The use of these small groups usually is one way in which teachers could take a more advanced, an intermediate, and a beginning group, and do the same activity with them. It doesn't sound much like an innovation, but it really was.

The third is where the teacher relied completely on student involvement. It is true that she followed an outline of major topics, but the rate at which she went over the topics and the order by which she covered them were not fixed. It depended on the students' interest, and in some way this was a very appealing thing. But this requires a tolerance for ambiguity that most teachers in that situation don't have. As long as the students kept up a dialogue, a discussion or involvement, everything was all right. The teacher had to be able to keep things going forward in whatever direction the students wanted to go. The content would be covered in the order chosen by the students, at their own pace. That was a "loose structured" approach which requires a special kind of teacher training.

Question:

We realize your study was totally urban, but we also know that you have considerable experience. Most of us at this table are concerned with wide-open spaces where there are not many people. We hoped, therefore, that you might have some suggestions for our type of problem.

Response:

I would certainly suggest that you do this type of study in other areas. I haven't had any exposure to this program other than in urban areas, so I can't even begin to respond. You heard Charles Kozoll yesterday talk about a very comparable study planned in the South, which is essentially rural. I don't know why such a thing couldn't be done individually or jointly. It would be to my benefit to help you. I would like to push the idea of using this type of research and would be glad to offer my assistance.

Question:

In Recommendation 22, you talked about teacher performance and establishing curriculum in higher education for the preparation of teachers. Are there some findings in your study that would point in the direction of teacher competencies which seem to be more effective from your point of view in terms of teacher personality, the way teachers interact with students, or specific things within that interaction?

Response:

We didn't really identify abstract characteristics of the teacher, so I am a little reluctant to answer that question. There were all kinds of personality types. We didn't identify patterns, however. It doesn't mean they weren't present, but we were unable to detect in looking over the information as carefully as anyone reasonably could a common pattern in terms of personality. We found teachers by and large were what the research says a teacher should be: warm, empathetic, outgoing, and so forth. To an unusual degree, the teachers who teach in ABE programs are that way, and it accounts substantially, I am sure, for their success. That doesn't tell you how to change, however. The right way to train teachers is to identify as carefully as possible what they are currently doing in the classroom and the next step of change, rather than teaching principles or general theory, which I don't have a great deal of faith in myself.

Question:

What kinds of activities should be going on in college classrooms where professors are supposedly teaching people to go into adult classroom situations or learning centers for adults, as well as outside the college classroom, to give teachers the interaction skills, so-to-speak, that will help them interact with ABE students?

Response:

I imagine half the room can answer you more articulately than I. But if I were doing it, I would want to put them in real classrooms. I think it would be very valuable, if you could create a situation without distorting things too badly, to focus a video camera on them for feedback and critiquing. I have certainly found that approach useful myself.

Question:

Where do we get the models for these people to see, or is it a matter of getting them interacting, and then working with them on their own interaction rather than using any kind of model? I am talking about a person as a model.

Response:

You can find teachers who everybody says are just great, and I suspect these could be the models. It seems to me this is one of the fundamental questions in the business: whether or not you use models. I don't think it would hurt to let students see somebody else teach. If I were doing it, however, I would take teachers and let them observe a wide range of comparable classroom situations, and then have them do an analysis of the differences and commonalities which they saw -- much as we did in the study, but on an obviously more modest basis. I suspect that you inductively generate a composite model teacher. Very often the way this person teaches is a function of his personality, and if student teachers tried to do what he did, they couldn't do it, or it wouldn't come off. But in seeing enough of these, the student would be able to make a prototype, to generalize. You could say, "Here's a generalized set of guidelines, but you have to make it on your own. We will help you by giving you feedback. We will critique you and protect you from the usual repercussions that result when you make mistakes.

Question:

If your study speaks to me in anyway, it speaks to me of interaction in the classroom. We are trying some of the things you mentioned in the beginning course of our teacher education program. I wondered if there is anything else you saw in the study that would give us a tip or two.

Response:

One thing I believe you ought to try pushing in your state is some kind of an adult education credentialing program for all adult teachers in the public schools, simply because these people need help to teach better, not because adult education has the magic answer. These teachers are not being given time off to receive help. Most administrators we interviewed said, "Well, I can't pull teachers off for training. It isn't fair to divert funds from teaching." There should be a legal requirement to release these people to get some training, and I don't know why universities couldn't do it.

Question:

It seems to me if we insist on what is called credentialing as in California and certification in most states of the United States, we will just get more of the same, because the control of credentialing and certification in most states is in the hands of people at this point in time who know really nothing more than what they have perceived about elementary and secondary education -- the very thing you are talking about -- as elementary education was 30 years ago. And if we can leave these kinds of options open until they get more data and more relationship, I will have a better feeling for it.

Response:

I suspect that is very wise. It seems to me the thing we could do is insist that there be in-service training,and let people experiment how to do it until somebody comes up with a pattern for credentialing. I would just add at this point that I do what I was suggesting with my own graduate students in adult education. If I possibly can, and it is very difficult logistically, I try to have them look at comparative programs, the kind they are interested in and others. Instead of a term paper, they write their field reports and then do an analysis on this comparative study of a variety of different adult education programs. I'm convinced that with professionals, this is a very valuable thing to do: letting people go into the settings in which they will eventually be teaching. Most of them come from university extension programs, public school programs, training in business and industry, or from community agencies which sponsor poverty related programs. When they go back, they ought to have this experience. The whole idea is to provide them with a repertoire of responses which they can fit into new situations. The only way they will be able to see precedents is to get them around comparative situations and help them generalize. Before they go to the books, I want them to have something to find out. And I want the questions they ask to come from what they see in the field and the way they analyze the data. Then I want them to go and see what the literature has to offer.

Question:

When you have them go to these different schools and study the programs, how long do you ask them to stay in any one?

Response:

It depends if you are doing it for one point of credit, or three points of credit, or a master's thesis, or a doctoral dissertation. I do it on all of these levels. I have one course for one point of credit in which they have to do some outside activity, and I insist they go and look at a minimum of three programs -- comparable programs of their choice -- and that they write field notes according to some standards, and an analysis for one point of credit. That's asking a whole lot. But they do it, they like it, they get involved, and it is exciting. One of the most exciting teaching experiences I have ever had is with a class I teach now in which the students analyze the field notes from the study. We are doing a source book of all the field notes. We are going to change all the names and the cities to protect individuals. The students spend the whole course going through these notes, trying to analyze for commonalities, looking for conceptual categories, and going back looking for the attributes of these categories, redefining, and trying to come up essentially with a new theory inductively. It is the best class I ever had in my life!

Question:

I feel that often we get together as a group of educators and talk about models and this sort of thing. Yet, at the same time, I think we miss the boat when the prospective teacher has little empathy from experience -- not vicarious experience, but going in and understanding how other people live and work and feel. Unless you live in a place where you are cold and hungry and you don't have enough to eat, and you don't have a bed to sleep on, you really aren't even touching these individuals. We always look in the classroom to see how other people feel. What you actually have to do is go and stay with these individuals. I've worked with it enough in individual situations where I think I have a deep empathy and understanding of how people operate as they see things from their world of perception. Unless we have this understanding, I think we fail and, as educators, we ought to be willing to step into these situations.

Response:

I very much agree. I served on an evaluation team and went around evaluating several departments who were having some problems, and I was just appalled. Here is the most exciting field that anybody could conceivably be in, and you interview education students -- all graduates -- and you ask them, "What do you think are the major problems of education?" And they say, "Discipline in the classroom . .!" It is astonishing how, at a time when there is more ferment in the field of education, more exciting innovation, more completely revolutionary concepts, education students are the last ones to be aware of it. I go to PTA meetings and the parents seem to be aware of it, but many students seem to be absolutely insulated. I just don't understand it.

Question:

I would like to respond to that. I speak as the President of the Association of Colleges, State Universities, and Land Grant Universities, and I think they would reinforce this. The national priorities for education have been identified by the Office of Education without any involvement or advice from colleges or schools of education except on an individual basis. Now you are asking us as deans of colleges of education to place adult education in a high priority during a period of economic recession which, in effect, means that we move other priorities to lower positions. At the same time, we were told this afternoon that program financing and administration will continue to be carried out through the state departments of education. These departments, then, have the same responsibility for adult education as they have for elementary teachers. How, this leads to two questions which relate to some of the reasons why we don't give adult education teacher training the proper perspective. 1) You called us together to consider a very important problem to society in establishing this priority. Why didn't the Office of Education contact colleges of education in the development of the conceptual plan rather than deciding beforehand how it would be done? "We are going to do it by state departments of education, and we want you here to tell us how you are going to operate in the scheme which we have already decided is going to be carried out." Secondly, if you really want us to do the job, why don't you make direct financial grants to the institutions of higher education so they can do the kinds of things that need to be done, rather than circumventing everything through the state department of education and having grants come from them to us.

Response by Paul Delker:

Your question implies many other questions. Here is a brief recap of how the American System works. The Office of Education doesn't say this money should go through departments of education. It is really saying that the state departments are better organized and carry more slack then the state colleges. The law says this is the way we will have to go, and Congress reflects the will of the people. The Office of Education doesn't set the standards. The nation does, and Congress responds. Secondly, within the executive branch of the federal government, the Office of Education has a mission which is quite distinct from any other agency, and that is to service theeducational system in this country. The educational system sees itself as a series of competing systems, whereas the Office of Education sees itself as serving one system which is made up of higher education, the public school and its extension: adult education, and the extensions of the university to serve adults. About direct grants: Congress says that 45 million dollars must go to the state departments, but the Commissioner has direct grant authority over 10 million dollars. Most of this money has been going to higher education for strengthening their own programs, but this has to be in concert with the state departments of education, or the whole purpose is defeated.

Question:

I don't think any of us in higher education think we are in competition with the public schools. We think we are in cooperation with them. Some of us don't believe that the state department of education is in the business to prepare teaching personnel. We think this is out job and that we should work closely with them. If you are going to plan a staffing pattern that will carry over and get to the hardcore problems that have been presented to us, you need one that will extend beyond a fiscal year. It will have to be a kind of ongoing thing if you really believe in a partnership arrangement between the public schools, the state department of education, the universities, and the other agencies involved. I am merely submitting that communication difficulties arise by going almost unilaterally via state departments of education. I think this kind of experience is great for us. It would have been greater, however, had it occurred before legislation was developed, and so forth, so that we could get involved in terms of input with reference to how we perceive program output. But we have not been solicited for this and other priority items.

Response by Paul Delker:

I think that the SREB (Southern Regional Education Board) project is appropo here. I doubt that anybody has been able to lick the one year funding restriction. Now, in the SREB project, the state directors got together with a number of deans in their region and said, "Let's make a regional proposal involving six states that will be on a three-year basis. Although we have to come to the trough every year, the general strategy is that the Federal government will give us two dollars for every state dollar the first year, one dollar for every dollar the second, and one dollar for every two dollars the third year, and then we are self-sustaining." That scheme was so good that all the bureaucrats couldn't afford to turn it down. Still, they are going up every year, and only get a certain amount of funding. The intent is there, however, and the question is whether it can be used in other regions.

BACK HOME PLANS

BACK HOME PLANS

On Wednesday morning, December 9, 1970, as the final portion of the Workshop, participants met to draft plans of action for their respective institutions, which they were to follow through on back home. These action plans are presented below as "BACK HOME PLANS." They have been modified from the authors' originals just enough to accommodate a consistent outline form.

BACK HOME PLAN: State College of Arkansas
Conway, Arkansas

I. Report to Council of Deans.

  A. Purpose: Relate impressions and experiences from Higher Education Administrators' Institute for Teacher Training in Adult Basic Education.

II. Arrange meeting with Mr. Black, Director of Adult Education, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas.

  A. Purpose:
    1. Determine extent of Adult Basic Education in Arkansas.
    2. Determine which organizations or agencies now sponsor or direct Adult Basic Education programs in Arkansas.
    3. Plan a conference involving representatives of agencies now involved in or interested in Adult Basic Education in the Central Arkansas Area.
    4. Determine availability of funds for the initiation and inauguration of adult basic education programs in Arkansas.
    5. Determine if the State Department would co-sponsor a one- or two-day conference on adult basic education.

III. Develop plans for the one- or two-day conference on adult basic education.

  A. Conference sponsor: State College of Arkansas and State Department of Education.

  B. Participants:
    1. State Welfare

State College of Arkansas (Continued)

2. Superintendents of schools
3. State Department of Education
4. Social welfare groups
5. Employment Security
6. Community development groups
7. Adult Basic Education teachers
8. Others to be determined

C. Purpose:
1. Alert interested groups to the need and extent of adult basic education programs in Arkansas.
2. Determine the need for trained teachers of adults.
3. Establish an Advisory Committee to work with the College in the development of an ABE teacher training program.

IV. Arrange for the establishment of a faculty committee to study, plan, and propose a program for the training of teachers for Adult Basic Education.

V. Limitations: At this time I do not see how we can have an Institute for the training of faculty before the school year 1971-1972. The speed at which this program moves will be determined by financial resources made available by the 1971 State Legislature of the State of Arkansas.

VI. Estimated Reporting Dates: February 1, 1971
March 1, 1971
April 1, 1971
July 1, 1971

B. A. Lewis
Dean, Graduate School

BACK HOME PLAN: Arkansas State University
State University, Arkansas

I. Study needs for adult education in Arkansas.

  A. Sources of help and advice:
    1. Arkansas State University ABE specialist
    2. State Director
    3. College personnel
    4. State Department of Education personnel
    5. Public school personnel
    6. Agency personnel (OEU, Rehabilitation, Vocational Education, KITs, etc.)

II. It is anticipated that:

  A. Above explorations will provide the justification for institutes designed to help designated individuals re-examine the present status of Adult Education in Arkansas and the exploration of broader program concepts.

  B. More detailed analysis of needs and an examination of current trends will lead to the development of a rationale for expanded programs.

III. If consensus of need occurs:

  A. Planning will proceed for:
    1. Viable workshops.
    2. Training programs.
    3. A master plan for the identification and development of training programs.

  B. Institutes will be planned either in cooperation with other institutions and agency personnel or sponsored by our institution with the assistance of Agency personnel.

  C. Either plan will enable full utilization of faculty members who will bear full or partial program responsibilities.

H. F. Hodge
Dean, College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

I. Background: There are many individuals and groups in Colorado who need to be involved in developing an ABE teacher education program. Colorado State University has both resources and experience to help bring together the resources within the University and State to deal with the problems of persons responsible for the disadvantaged adult.

II. Plan Sequence:

A. Step One: Bring individuals and groups together to determine what is being done in ABE work and to identify problems needing attention. The idea of this process is that through participation, individuals and groups will become aware of the ABE program, and will begin to see ways of helping with the teacher-training program.
   1. On-Campus Participation: Duplicate aspects of Utah Workshop at CSU.
      a. Key persons to involve: top administrators, deans, department heads and faculty.
   2. Off-Campus Participation:
      a. Work with the State Department of Education and the Advisory Committee for Adult Basic Education.
      b. Work with other institutions, organizations and agencies who have resources and concern for ABE programs.
      c. Utilize the ABE participants, teachers and administrators in the identification of problems and planning of programs.

B. Step Two: With representatives of above groups, plan a workshop.
   1. Purpose: To focus on institutional and statewide problems in ABE Teacher Training.
   2. Consultants: Utilize consultant assistance provided by Project.

C. Step Three: Implement plans developed at Workshop.

III. Approach: The above approach is built on the belief that concern and action can be developed by within planning rather than planning by a Workshop participant. Hence, my role will be one of getting people together to think through their roles and responsibilities. Thus, the approach is process-centered rather than task-centered.

Denzil Clegg
Associate Professor of Cont. Educ.
Department of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

I. Hold Ad Hoc Planning Session.

   A. Participants:
      1. State Adult Education Director
      2. Dean, Education
      3. Academic Vice President
      4. Coordinator, Continuing Education
      5. Director (Assoc.) Agricultural Extension Service
      6. Coordinator of Vocational Teacher Education

   B. Purpose: Above group plots strategy for development of teacher training program for adults.
      1. Includes tentative assessment of need.
      2. Discusses possible funding.

II. Hold In-Service Faculty Seminar: With concurrence of Ad Hoc, group plans in-service faculty (and other) seminar to tentatively meet off-campus.

   A. Participants:
      1. Those listed above
      2. H. McClusky - (Possible AE curriculum? What kind of education do adult teachers need?)
      3. Psychology Department (2 or 3)
      4. Education Department (4 or 5)
      5. Regional Director, Continuing Education
      6. Agricultural Extension and Home Economics Staff involved with Adult Education
      7. Vocational Education - key staff
      8. State Department of Education key personnel (Warner, Engelking, Federal Programs men?)
      9. Office of Higher Education, or member of Regents
      10. Real Estate Commission representative
      11. NRTS Coordinator
      12. Suzanne Weiss type

University of Idaho (Continued)

III. Meantime: Consider alternate plans for assessment of basic adult education needs in isolated communites:

A. In-depth survey of a "typical" community?

B. Other means (local surveys) distributed to those on property tax rolls?

IV. Report: By January 15, 1971; will include reporting schedule and place.

E. V. Samuelson
Dean, College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho

I. Hold Seminar in Adult Education.

A. Participants:
1. Faculty of vocational-technical working with ABE:
   a. Harold Garbett
   b. Gordon Jones
   c. Wilber Gard
2. Director of Special Services: Perry Swisher
3. State Director of ABE: M[illegible]rvin Rose
4. State Assistant Superintendent in charge of this area: Carl Warner
5. Interested faculty in other disciplines (Sociology, Government, Anthropology, etc.)
   a. Lingren
   b. Eyre
   c. Butler
6. Administrator of College of Education
   a. Willey
   b. Lloyd
   c. Scott
7. Faculty of College of Education
   a. Sheppard
   b. Benintendi
   c. Jones
   d. Rexroat
   e. Morrey

Idaho State University (Continued)

- B. Purpose: Study the need for preparation of teachers in Adult Education.
  - 1. Specifically, in area of both Adult Education and Preparation of Teaching in Adult Education:
    - a. To discover what is currently being done.
    - b. To discover what needs to be done.
    - c. To make possible recommendations in the area of adult education and specifically ABE for teacher preparation.

II. Propose a program in Adult Education at Idaho State.

- A. Work with the following:
  - 1. Vocational-Technical
  - 2. ABE State Director
  - 3. Department of Professional Preparation
  - 4. Representatives of Higher Education (State Office)
  - 5. Appropriate Faculty

- B. Purpose: Plan specific programs to meet the needs of teachers of ABE programs.

R. L. Willey
Dean, College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: The State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

I. Initial Activity (In Process):

- A. Hold exploratory discussions:
  - 1. On-Campus:
    - a. Associate Dean, College of Education
    - b. Adult Education faculty
  - 2. Off-Campus:
    - a. Chief, Adult Education Section and Director, Adult Basic Education Program, Department of Public Instruction.
    - b. Post-secondary Area school directors of Adult Education and other local Adult Education administrative personnel.
    - c. Instructional personnel, local Adult Education programs, including adult basic education.
- B. Purpose:
  - 1. Preliminary identification of nature and scope of concerns of Adult Education practitioners.
  - 2. Preliminary determination of data input from field for campus consideration.

II. Second Step: (Tentative)

- A. Collect, organize and do preliminary interpretation of data.
  - 1. Determine scope, kind and sources of additional data deemed necessary as a result of initial activity described above.

III. Third Step: (Tentative)

- A. Present, validate and refine data.
- B. Involve:
  - 1. Inter-disciplinary faculty members
  - 2. State Department of Public Instruction personnel
  - 3. Local practitioners
    - a. Administrators
    - b. Instructors
    - c. Adult Students
    - d. Citizens - non-educational participants
  - 4. Faculty members from other two Iowa Regents institutions.

C. Purpose:
   1. Clarify need and potential response for greater University effort to prepare/serve practitioners in area of adult education.
   2. Clarify nature and scope of desired experiences.

D. At some point in Step Three, Consultative Service of Higher Education Administrators' Institute would be utilized based upon tentative expectation of need.

IV. Fourth Step:

A. Emerge from preceding steps:
   1. Would concern desired modifications in existing graduate studies program in adult education currently in operation at the State University of Iowa, and hopefully, similar requests at other two Regents Universities in the State of Iowa (Iowa State University and Northern Iowa University).

A. C. Burman
Professor of Education
College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

I. Hold internal discussion of present Adult Education program and planned consortium.

   A. Inform Education Department Heads and Directors, other MSU Department Heads and interested faculty of conference reaction and future plans.

II. Hold one-day conference.

   A. Participants:
      1. Deans from University of Montana, Eastern, Northern, Western.
      2. State Department of Education

   B. Purpose:
      1. Discuss conference at Park City.
      2. Present total plan for cooperative effort in training teachers; get reactions and suggestions.

   C. Possible consultant: Roy Minnis

III. Waive transfer credit limit requirement.

   A. Since MSU is the only institution with a Master's program in Adult Education, suggest waiver of requirement for Master's in Adult Education as first step in cooperative training of Adult Education teachers.

   B. Justification: Would allow utilization of strengths of faculty in any of our State institutions and would make all Education programs available to more people in the state.

IV. Hold a conference regarding needs of Adult Education programs.

   A. Include representatives from:
      1. Indian Tribal Councils
      2. Model City representatives
      3. Public School Adult Educators
      4. Agriculture and Home Economic Extension
      5. ABE teachers and students
      6. Vocation-technology schools
      7. Community colleges
      8. Welfare agencies

Montana State University (Continued)

V. Get suggestions from state-wide planning committee of University and Colleges re: above conference.

  A. Purpose: To consider program changes from present plan.

A. C. Blome
Assistant Dean
College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: University of Nevada at Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada

I. Meeting is scheduled December 11, 1970 in Las Vegas with the Nevada State Director of Adult Education.

  A. Based on the outcome of this meeting, future plans will be formulated.

II. There will be a secondary education faculty meeting (possibly in January) to determine feeling for involvement in an adult education teacher training program.

III. Based on the outcome of both of the above meetings, a decision on involvement and extent of involvement will be forthcoming. More details would be available then.

J. B. Case
Chairman, Secondary Education
College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

I. Make a Conference Report: A report of this Park City conference will be made to an Adult Education committee in the University College of Education. This committee is interdisciplinary and will also have a member from SWCEL (Regional Lab).

II. Report to SDE State Director, Mr. Tom Trujillo

A. To be included in report:
   1. Conference proceedings.
   2. Suggestions for next steps in planning.

III. Tentative Plan:

A. Suggest to College of Education Adult Education committee that it call together a broader group to plan a conference.
   1. To be included in this broader planning group:
      a. SDE Director
      b. Representatives of management, labor
      c. Other universities
      d. Public schools
      e. Poverty group trainers (WIN, COP, etc.)
   2. Function of this group:
      a. Clarify goals for such a conference.
      b. Communicate with the University of Utah concerning a consultant.

R. L. Holemon
Associate Dean
Curriculum and Instruction

G. M. Wright
Assistant Prof., Educational
Foundations and ABE Specialist,
Cont. Ed. and Ext. Div.

BACK HOME PLAN: Nicholls State University
Thibodaux, Louisiana

I. Convene advisory committee on Program consent (two or possibly three sessions with consultants).

   A. Participants:
      1. State ABE Director
      2. Parish Supervisors of ABE
      3. University personnel
      4. Consultants

II. Identify graduate courses and formulate new courses where necessary.

III. Determine structure of M. Ed. Program.

IV. Evaluate proposed degree program.

V. Identify number of prospective teacher trainees.

VI. Determine and forecast costs of program.

VII. Evaluate all resources for success of program.

VIII. Submit for approvals to:

   A. Graduate Council
   B. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
   C. Louisiana State Board of Education
   D. Louisiana Higher Education Coordinating Council

O. E. Lovell
Dean, Graduate School

BACK HOME PLAN: University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota

I. Background:

A. Pre-1970: Adult Education has been a struggling infant at this institution for some time. Although verbal agreement as to its importance is available, there has not been sufficient dialogue to identify the specific nature of an adult education program in this institution nor the support necessary to launch a successful program.

B. 1970: Within the past year, increased strength for developing an adult education program has been acquired; this strength lies in two University staff additions in administrative positions who strongly support the development of such a program. However, this support is somewhat negated by the limited financial resources of the University at this time, making it unlikely that any new programs will be introduced.

C. The University has as a staff member the State Director of Adult Education (Mr. J. Pennington, Associate Dean of Continuing Education). This fortunate arrangement will, I am sure, facilitate our movement into adult education.

II. Development of program in Adult Education by Department of Education:

A. Develop series of courses in adult education.

B. Include experience in this field as integral part of the program for school administrators.

C. Perhaps develop an undergraduate course for prospective teachers in conjunction with suitable clinical experiences.

A. W. Sturges
Professor and Chairman
Department of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: Central State College
Edmond, Oklahoma

I. Reports:

  A. Report Contents:
    1. First Report: Present planning of workshop sessions, stating steps to be taken upon return from workshop.
    2. Second Report:
      a. Present planning committee progress.
      b. Establish date for Institutional (C.S.C.) Seminar on Adult Basic Education Teacher Training at Central State College.
      c. Discuss state and regional planning.
      d. Discuss resource person.
    3. Third Report:
      a. Present specific areas to be considered in Seminar on Teacher Training.
      b. Discuss role to be serviced by resource person.
      c. Firm up arrangements.
    4. Fourth Report: Present Seminar on Teacher Preparation Program: report on sessions and findings with course of action and program planning accomplished at this time.

  B. Tentative Reporting Dates:
    1. Second Report: January 15, 1971
    2. Third Report: March 15, 1971
    3. Fourth Report: June 15, 1971

II. Planning Committee Members:

  A. Academic Vice President
  B. Division Chairman of Education and Psychology
  C. Director of Teacher Education and Student Teaching
  D. Adult Education consultant to Regional Projects
  E. Adult Reading Specialist
  F. Language Arts - Humanities Teacher/Educator
  G. Math Teacher Educator
  H. Science Teacher Educator
  I. Business Teacher Educator
  J. Home Economics Teacher Educator
  K. Industrial Arts Teacher Educator
  L. State Department Fieldworker - Curriculum and Personnel In-service Trainer

Central State College (Continued)

III. Tentative dates for Seminar on Adult Teacher Education Programming: March or April 1971. Specific dates in Second Report.

IV. Tentative plans for action on planning a Teacher Education Program for ABE Teachers at Central State College include:

A. Hold a conference during the week of December 14-18, 1970, in the office of the State Director of Adult Basic Education relative to this Workshop and course of action.
   1. The Representative (contact person) from the University of Oklahoma to be involved.

B. Confer with Vice President and President of college to report on this Workshop. Arrange for program planning committee as stated to be organized through the Academic Office.

C. Hold first meeting of the planning committee, January 1971 (date to be established after survey of calendar). This committee to explore and organize to set up seminar in program planning for ABE Teacher Education at Central.

D. After specific plans have been established at Central, a request will be submitted specifying the needed resource person having expertise for seminar planned in Step C.

E. Utilize the resource person in state planning for those aspects of the Adult Education Program which might best be carried through in Cooperative State/Multi-Institutional Ventures.

F. Cooperate with other Institutions and State Adult Education Leadership in Regional Planning session in Dallas, Texas.

E. L. Petty
Chairman
Division of Education and
Psychology

BACK HOME PLAN: University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

I. Contact University of Utah on or before January 15, 1971 regarding a resource person to spend a week assisting the University of Oklahoma in developing a training program for ABE teachers.

II. Plan for additional communications on March 15 and June 15 of 1971.

III. At present: There exists a committee of faculty and off-campus individuals charged with developing Graduate Adult Degree Program.

IV. Discuss Park City Workshop with the Oklahoma State Director of Adult Education.

   A. Have Dr. Ed Petty of Central State College there too.

   B. After this discussion, take steps to determine whether a facet of our "Adult Degree Thrust" can effectively be directed toward the training of Adult Basic Education Teachers.

E. F. Cates
Associate Dean
College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota

I. Establish a workshop Planning Committee on adult education involving University staff from all disciplines.

   A. Consider expansion of committee to include non-university people (business, industry, minorities, state agencies, etc.)

II. Organize a workshop around the following format:

   A. Investigate status of Adult Education in its broadest aspects, within the University and the state as a whole.

   B. Identify major problem areas in the development of a continuing adult education program, i.e., administration, finance, training and programs.

   C. Propose suggested solutions to problem identified.

   D. Inventory resources within and without the University for implementation of solutions.

   E. Develop tentative plans of action.

T. E. Moriarty
Dean, School of Education

L. M. Carlson
Director of State-Wide
Education Services

BACK HOME PLAN: South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota

I. Pre-conference developments:

A. Meetings and discussions with the following have taken place:
1. State Director of Adult Education
2. State Advisory Committee for Adult Education (Staff member at SDSU is key member of committee)
3. Dean of College of Agriculture
4. Dean of College of Arts and Science
5. Dean of Academic Affairs
6. President of SDSU
7. Identification of goals to education staff at staff retreat.

B. Two lower level graduate courses have been developed: "Adult Teaching and Learning," and "Organization and Administration of Adult Education," both scheduled to be offered Summer Session 1971.

C. There has been cooperation with State Director of Adult Education in development and operation of adult basic education institutes the past three summers, both for credit or non-credit.

D. An agreement has been made to be involved in Project Communi-Link with Colorado State University.

II. Post-conference developments (proposed):

A. Hold Education staff meeting to review findings and implications of Institute of Higher Education Administrators of Adult Education.

B. Meet with key personnel within University in an attempt to develop a multi-discipline approach to adult education.

C. Meet with State Director of Adult Education.

D. Meet with State Advisory Committee for Adult Education.

E. Meet with State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

F. Formulate plans for workshop in ABE in cooperation with all above groups and through assistance from Utah Project.

South Dakota State University (Continued)

G. Invite key personnel of all groups to workshop including persons from other higher education institutions in South Dakota.

H. Develop roles by specific groups---hopefully multi-discipline approach for teacher training at both graduate and undergraduate level.

I. Develop in-service education program for existing ABE programs in state including on-site visitation to local school districts.

J. Possibly get involvement of research on a regional basis.

V. D. Everrett
Head, Department of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas

I. Hold a meeting as soon as possible with Texas Education Agency personnel.

   A. Purpose: Report results of Institute discussions.

II. Arrange a workshop.

   A. Participants:
      1. Faculty
      2. Administration
      3. Agency
      4. School superintendent
      5. Special consultants

   B. Purpose:
      1. Inform participants about Institute.
      2. Set up committees for planning and advising.

III. Develop a proposal requesting special pilot program in teacher training for Adult Education.

   A. Emphasis of pilot program: Identify a University training program which will constitute a basis for the Agency to establish an Adult Education teacher endorsement.

O. L. Dorsey
Dean, College of Professional Schools

BACK HOME PLAN: Texas A & M
College Station, Texas

I. Contact faculties and state directors about forming a regional association.

   A. Purpose:
      1. To strengthen the adult education programs in our own institutions and the state as a whole, by working cooperatively rather than in isolation.

II. Hold regional meeting:

   A. Time and place: Early 1971 in Dallas, Texas.

   B. Consultant: Request Dr. Howard McClusky to be furnished by the University of Utah project as consultant to this organizational meeting.

III. Now in process:

   A. Texas A & M has initiated the process to secure a degree program in adult education.
      1. A Master of Education program for practitioners has been tentatively designed with options in General Adult Education, Community Education, and Extension Education.
      2. Ph.D. is primarily for researchers and college teachers.

   B. We are presently forming an advisory committee composed of local practitioners, a representative of the Texas Education Agency, an outside teacher trainer, and a local school superintendent. We will request assistance from the University of Utah project in providing Denzil Clegg, if available, to help as consultant to our first advisory committee meeting late in January.

Earl Jones
Director, Adult Education

BACK HOME PLAN: University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

I. Set up a committee to work on plan for in-service education workshop for faculty.

   A. Sources of planning help:
      1. University of Wyoming
      2. Community Colleges
      3. Public Schools
      4. State Department of Education
      5. Representative lay persons

   B. Purpose of workshop:
      1. Develop an appreciation and enthusiasm for adult education.
      2. Develop attitudes favorable to ABE on part of bachelor degree recipients; the graduate programs in adult education are well established.

   C. Time, place and participants of workshop: to be decided by planning committee.
      1. Could not be held before March.
      2. Consultant: Request Howard McClusky as outside resource person, if funds are available for travel for persons to attend the workshop.

L. A. Walker
Acting Dean
College of Education

BACK HOME PLAN: Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska

I. A regional conference is proposed by the above states.

   A. Proposed dates: March 14, 15, 16 of 1971

   B. Preliminary planning meeting: January 12, 1971

   C. Place: Both to be held in Kansas City, Missouri

   D. Participants:
      1. Representatives of college administration
      2. Representatives of faculty and extension services
      3. State directors
      4. Field personnel
      5. Outside consultant help

   E. General conference plan:
      1. Determine state and institutional needs.
      2. Determine resulting teacher competencies.
      3. Formulate plan for ensuing programs.

   F. Funds: The institutions engaging in this cooperative effort propose that the normal allocation of funds expended for consultants and their travel for each institution be consolidated and provided to the above-mentioned group to expend as needed to hold said conference.

APPENDIXES

AGENDA

WORKSHOP

Higher Education Administrator's Institute for Teacher Training in Adult Basic Education

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1970

8:00 A.M.	COFFEE	
9:00 A.M.	GOAL FORMATION	Shizuko N. Harry College of Education University of Utah
10:00 A.M.	BREAK	
10:30 A.M.	INTRODUCTIONS Charles H. Monson, Jr. Associate Academic Vice President University of Utah Stephen P. Hencley Dean, College of Education University of Utah Paul V. Delker U. S. Office of Education Washington, D. C. Roy B. Minnis Region VIII Program Officer for the U. S. Office of Education Denver, Colorado	
	ORIENTATION TO WORKSHOP	Alton P. Hadlock Project Director University of Utah
12:00 Noon	LUNCH	
1:30 P.M.	A REPORT OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD PROJECT IN ADULT LEARNING	Charles E. Kozoll Southern Regional Education Board Atlanta, Georgia
3:00 P.M.	BREAK	
3:30 P.M.	SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS	
4:15 P.M.	PLENARY SESSION	
5:00 P.M.	DINNER	
8:00 P.M.	DEMONSTRATION OF SIMULATED GAME EXPERIENCES	Shizuko N. Harry Alton P. Hadlock

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1970

8:30 A.M.	THEORIES OF ADULT LEARNING FOR TEACHERS OF ADULTS	Howard R. McClusky University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
10:00 A.M.	BREAK	
10:30 A.M.	SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS	
11:15 A.M.	PLENARY SESSION	
12:00 Noon	LUNCH AND RECREATION	
3:30 P.M.	DEVELOPING A THEORY OF ADULT TEACHING	Jack Mezirow Teachers College at Columbia University New York
5:00 P.M.	DINNER	
7:00 P.M.	SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS	
7:45 - 8:15 P.M.	PLENARY SESSION	

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1970

8:30 A.M.	INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP PLANNING FOR BACK-HOME TRAINING OF FACULTY
10:00 A.M.	BREAK
10:30 A.M.	MORE PLANNING FOR BACK-HOME TRAINING
12:00 Noon	LUNCH Extended through 2:00 P.M. to allow time for check-out from hotel.
2:00 P.M.	REPORTS ON BACK-HOME PLANS (The Institute staff would like a copy.)

FAREWELL

WORKSHOP GOALS

These are the goals that were delineated by six work groups during the "Goal Formation" session held on Monday, December 7 at 9:30 a.m. These goals were to be further developed during the workshop and then put into use in planning teacher training programs upon the participants' return to their respective campuses.

GROUP 1:

1. Outline the characteristics of a good ABE program and the type of organization which would maximize utilization of resources.
2. Develop "ways" for the program in Adult Education to serve the needs of educators and others.

GROUP 2:

1. Develop a curriculum for the preparation of teachers and administrators for adult education programs.
2. Locate program responsibility.
3. Find ways and means of involving multi-cultural populations in the above.

GROUP 3:

1. Determine the needs of adult education in the region and implement programs to meet these needs.
2. Create an understanding of, enthusiasm for, and realization of the responsibilities for adult education among faculty, students, teachers and administrators.

GROUP 4:

1. Determine needed competences in teaching the adult and a basic core program.
2. Consider structural matters: degree programs, certification (if any, where needed?).

GROUP 5:

1. Define the competencies required of ABE teachers.
2. Devise a curriculum for adult education trainees.

GROUP 6:

1. Comprehend more fully realistic needs and rationale for expanded graduate studies opportunities in adult education at my institution.
2. Acquire information about programs to be used as models or as sources of ideas for program planning in our home schools.

ADVENTURE AND THE EMERGING ROLES OF THE ADULT EDUCATION LEADER

Howard Y. McClusky

I would like to begin by taking a fresh cut at some factors which are making the continuing education of adults a concern of growing centrality for our times. You may be already convinced this may end up by being only an exercise in reinforcement. But I'm shooting for higher stakes and I hope we can discover some new dimensions in a situation the significance and scale of which I believe we do not yet fully comprehend.

First, let us look at what I like to call the concept of margin. It can be simply stated, but has important implications for our argument. Margin is a function of the relationship of load to power. By load we mean the self and social demands required by a person or agency to maintain a minimal level of autonomy. By power we mean the resources, i.e., abilities, possessions, position, allies, etc. which a person or agency can command in coping with load. We can increase margin by reducing load or by increasing power, and we can control margin by modifying either power or load. When load continually matches, or exceeds power, and if both are fixed, i.e., out of control, or irreversible, the situation becomes highly vulnerable or flirts with breakdown. (This condition resembles some of Selyee's laboratory experiments on stress). If, however, load and power can be controlled, and better yet, a person or agency has a margin of unutilized power, he has more autonomy, as an adult he is prepared to meet unanticipated exigencies, can respond to more options, can in fact engage in exporatory, innovative, creative activities, can take risks, etc., i.e., do those things that make him more than a self maintaining vegetable.

The above speech is reprinted in this Report with the kind permission of Dr. McClusky. The speech was first delivered at the annual meeting of the National University Extension Association on April 24, 1967 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. It has since been reprinted in the NUEA Spectator. It is included here as a relevant and important addition to the topics discussed at the Workshop.

Because of increasing health, more and better education, and growing economic resources, the margins of both persons and the society are growing. These margins can, and will be devoted more and more to education, which will in turn create more power. As a consequence, the domain of the educational enterprise will escalate to dimensions which we cannot yet fully foretell.

Another factor contributing to a growing demand for the continuing education of adults brings up our familiar theme of change. It is highly redundant to belabor the facts of change to an audience of this kind, but the character and rate of change deserve some elaboration. The character of change can range on a continuum from a minor incremental adaptation of an existing situation, all the way to a complete transformation of the situation, or a substitution of something wholly new. As one moves from the minor to the radical points on this continuum, one moves from a minor to radical need for education. My point is that change is becoming more and more radical, leading to more and more changes in kind, as well as changes in degree. And returning to the point of margin, I believe this is in part attributable to the fact that both persons and the society are using their margins to produce change, e.g., the R and D (Research and Development) departments of industry.

But the rate of change is also significant. Here we have at least two subproblems. One could be charted as a simple linear increase, where rate of increase would be known and outcomes predictable. Another would be curvilinear with rate accelerating and outcomes unpredictable. In both cases our educational task would be complicated by the stage that an individual or agency or community occupies in the career cycle of the problem solved.

What briefly do we mean by the career cycle of a problem? Simply that issues, difficulties, problems, etc., do not arise suddenly out of nothing. They have a history, a beginning, a latency, a fluctuating rise, fall, and a varying amount of arousal potential. They simmer, subside, reappear, accumulate, heat up. You will note I am being loose with my language. But it all adds up to what I call a career cycle. In a simpler society, and when change was slow if not glacial, for practical purposes time would often take care of the situation. If it were a crisis, you could sit still and things would blow over, or if it were gradual, people could habituate and adapt. For many people and in some places, this is still probably true. But because many problems today are cumulative and rate of change so great this is less and less true. In fact, one characteristic of our current scene is that many problems now occupy an advanced stage in their career cycle and the lead time that may be applied to their solution is rapidly running out.

One of these is obviously the plight of the inner industrial cities, the pollution of Lake Erie is probably another, control of nuclear energy for the world as a whole, the population explosion, and returning home, race relations. There are others who are parallel examples in personal living, such as prevention of illness, maintenance of health, house, income, etc.

In other words, the career cycle of many personal, agency, community, institutional, and social problems includes a potential "moment of truth" which can and should be anticipated well in advance of its appearance.

It is not surprising, therefore, that planning as a means of anticipating and premobilizing resources has become a dominant characteristic of our times, and that we must become oriented to the future in order to make change productive if not to survive. The meaning of this for education at all levels is clear. Childhood and youth education must develop abilities which will transfer to the future, and the adult must have continuous access to education. The point to stress is that time becomes an important dimension.

At this point, let us return to my beginning paragraph. I said there that I wanted to take a fresh cut at factors which are generating a climate increasingly favorable to the education of adults. I have said that increase of margin for both individual and the society increase both the opportunity and need for education, and I also have argued that rate and character of change gives an educative approach to the future a special significance and urgency for adult education.

In continuing my case, I wish now to turn psychological. In short, I believe that our argument becomes more compelling when to the points of margin and change we add the growing evidence of the adult's ability to make an educative if not creative response to the demands of life long living. The insight coming to us from personality, life cycle and learning theory in my judgment gives us reason to take a much more positive view of the developmental potential of adults than we ever have done in the past. Very few doubt anymore that we can teach an old dog new tricks, but there is a growing body of evidence to indicate that there may be some tricks that only an old dog can best learn.

More specifically, I believe that the typical surveys of growth, i.e., increase, flattening, and decrease, or growth maintenance and decline are more a reflection of the adult condition than it is a reflection of adult potential. For example, tests of psychological ability indicate that general ability to learn lasts at a high level well into the late sixties and seventies. But some subabilities survive better than others. Again, personality theory and learning indicate that anxiety and the ego defenses against anxiety can have a major impact on learning, especially creativity. Finally, learning theory indicates that experience can under proper conditions, become an enormous asset in learning, but can become fully implemented only when properly used. When one realizes then that so much of adult life is loaded with anxiety and the repetition of the familiar rather than risk taking, and exploratory discovery of the new, it is no wonder that adult performance reflects the charts and descriptions so often ascribed to it.

To use the concept of margin, most adults appear to possess or use little margin for learning and growth and according to the law of exercise, fail to cultivate the potential of which they are capable. In a recent research, one of our doctoral candidates turned up extremely convincing evidence that adults past 65 with a history of participation in lifelong learning were much happier, better adjusted and more productive than those who did not so participate. Even if you argue that the investigation favored persons who are by nature participative, you would still be forced to concede the importance of the reinforcing value of learning.

So far then, we have called attention to powerful forces undergirding the adult education enterprise: margin which creates both opportunity and need, the rate and career cycle which creates need and urgency, and the capacity of adults for an educational response.

At this point I wish to turn to a different category of discussion. I want to do a brief critique of the social scene and by so doing suggest some areas of adventure wherein the adult educator might operate.

First I am concerned about the source and character of some of the values that dominate so much of the direction and preferences of our behavior. In too many instances value is based on relative position in a scale of prestige, power or status and not on the intrinsic and unranked worth of events, products, things and people. In some cases I believe this trend is almost pathological.

Another cause for concern related to the value systems of our society is an overemphasis on instrumental values at the expense of values derived from expressive and appreciative experience. Adult education can provide an important corrective in this domain. It need not insist on a percentile ranking of the performance of its students, and it could provide one place where a full bodied response to an educational offering is respected in its own right.

Second, I am concerned about the excesses of and side effects of specialization. True: specialization is to a degree responsible for our fabulous economic production and expertise. And in the academic realm it is the source of prestige and advancement. Also, it will not go away simply by talking about it. But in excess in society, it is often the cause of alienation, and in colleges and universities it produces some of the most serious dilemmas with which the higher learning must contend. Specialization is often the enemy of education. "The menace of the uneducated expert" is no idle quip. In my judgment, adult education has a better opportunity to restore balance to the instructional scene than any other aspect of the educational enterprise.

Third, I am concerned about a new kind of stratification emerging in our society. One aspect is ecological and the other educational in character. The ecological is contained in the growing social class differentiation in the developing patterns of metropolitan residential living. More and more metropolitan areas are becoming little homogeneous islands of like level people ranging from slum to suburb. Going are the days when people of all social classes lived within the radius of a few miles and when the children of all class levels attended the same elementary and high school.

Continuing the educational aspect, if we start with the dropout and continue with the graduate of the high school, college and professional school, we encounter one kind of hierarchy. Or, if we begin with the graduate of a community college, continue successively with teachers colleges, the municipal college, small denominational colleges to the prestigious ivy league colleges and universities, we have another hierarchy.

The relevance of these facts for our theme of stratification becomes clear when we confront the almost one to one relationship between the level of learning and the point of entry and advance in the major life changes of society. In our status conscious, success worshipping social order, the message is coming through strong and clear. We must learn, keep on learning, or perish. This is the awesome fact of our times. But the unexpected and too often unacknowledged consequence of this fact is the gradual creation of a new form of stratification which, if misunderstood and unchecked, could produce serious consequences for the well-being of society. In the U.S.A., we have been proud of the relative fluid and open character of our social structure. The new fact is that it is open more and more to those who are educated, and almost completely closed to those who are undereducated.

Adult education can make a major contribution to correcting this situation. It can provide a point of re-entry and advance at any point in the life cycle. No level of formal schooling need be regarded as the level determining the ultimate status of the individual. This can be corrected at any moment the person is ready and able to engage in systematic instruction. Adult education can and should be the gate to keeping the structure of society loose and open.

My fourth concern may be simply stated as that of achieving and maintaining a sense of "unum" in the midst of a growing "pluribus." Again, we select a much rehearsed dilemma of the American scene and one highly representative of the contradictions characteristic of our life. We appear to be developing a homogenized, mass culture on the one hand in the midst of some deeply rooted ideological class and racial cleavages on the other. In function and in fact, we are highly interdependent but we have no corresponding internalized commitment to that fact. The answer lies at several levels and in various departments. In the field of organization it means the humanization of bureaucracy and the encouragement of informal alongside formal systems. In the realm of values it means the enrichment and reinforcement of our belief in the dignity of man, in our commitment to a sense of fair play, and the democratic process of problem solving. And in education it means a more explicit attention to the development of a sense of community as a goal of instruction. In all these respects, the franchise for the adult educator is impressive.

The foregoing critique makes no pretense of being a definitive or inclusive assessment of the current social scene. It is offered as illustrative of some of the areas of concern wherein the adult educator in higher education must operate. You can draw up your own inventory and formulate your own criteria, but whatever scheme you devise, both the society and the domain of higher education will more and more require a high order of educational statesmanship in the fulfillment of the new franchise herein implied.

Before indicating more explicitly what this franchise might entail, let us confront some of the realities with which average adult educators in higher education must deal. To do so, we must first of all remember the intermediate position he occupies between the academic center of his host institution on the one hand, and the client in the community outside the institution on the other hand. Typically, a large part of his program or operation is merged response to the offerings of the one and the requests of the other. In this role of broker, or mediator, if not arbitrator and negotiator, the adult educator in higher education may not perceive himself as having much leeway to adventure, and explore new territory. The broker or mediating role will of necessity always be a major part of his program.

But if we can accept the two general points I have tried to make, namely that powerful new forces are creating a demand and need for adult education, and that there are critical personal and social issues which must be faced for the well-being and health of the society, the role of the adult educator in higher education must be much more creative and innovative than the traditional role of broker has permitted him to be. True, we may use a lack of resource as justification if not explanation for sticking with the traditional role. But we cannot use lack of resource as an excuse for failing to envisage the job of adult educator in dimensions required by the society, and for which facilities and talent are rapidly becoming available. Perhaps a fresh perspective on the new franchise and a willingness to take risks in venturing new paths could attract resources. In fact, I believe it can be argued that there has never been a time more ripe for the invention of new programs, projects, formats, devices, facilities, than at the present time. Whatever one thinks of the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, or the beginnings of the work or title, the fact remains that these and similar ventures have created a ferment, sensitivity and readiness for change never known at any earlier time in our history. At all levels, the last decade has been the most exciting, venturesome, creative, provocative period in the history of American education, and of all levels the domain of adult education has been as exciting as any. The next decade should be even more so. The need for innovation and creation of new patterns of education is so great that there is some question as to whether the existing establishment can and will move rapidly enough to accommodate the needs now being generated. This is, among other things, the significance of the expanding entrance of the private sector into the field of education. And the growing partnership of the government with the private sector could be one way which, either by accident or design, new institutional forms will be created, or basic changes within the structure of existing institutional forms will be shaped. The need is here, the talent and facilities are here, resources are here. It is a question as to whether the adult educator in the existing establishment will and can take hold in a fashion sufficiently creative to produce an effective response.

At the risk of neglecting operational details, let me suggest some roles which, if activated, could contribute to such a response.

Returning to the second point in our first section, the adult educator would be analyst, spotter and anticipator of trends which if extrapolated would without control, diversion, or restraint, present problems of critical dimensions to the society. Second, in his role as social analyst, he would scan the scene for bipolarities, or tensions, and arrange for bringing them to light and in dialogue. Third, continuing his role as analyst and programmer, he would also scan the scene for orbits within the society which fail habitually to intersect and, if possible, bring them together in communication. At this point, he would be the arranger of communication. Next, he would spot the class and racial cleavages of the society, and in advance of overheated crisis promote analysis of issues and association of leaders. He would in effect convene the dialectic. Next and overlapping, he would map the leadership grid of the community and assess the role of its members as potential allies in his efforts at education.

In effect,he would arrange the social audit.

For the more conventional course program, through processes of counseling and interpretation of data which such processes would yield, he would discover new patterns of need for instruction, both credit and noncredit, and in collaboration with his colleagues in the disciplines, find new teaching formats and content with which to meet their needs.

He would be aware of and cooperate with other agencies of adult education in the communities and the larger region of which they are a part; in fact, he would conceive of the communities themselves as educative and agents of education.

He would assume that among his colleagues he is not alone in his concern for the educational well-being of the community. He would seek out and encourage his colleagues to join the adventure with him. At the same time, he would assume that among the knowledgeable and thoughtful leaders of the community outside the university, there are also persons who share his concerns. He would encourage and mobilize each group either unilaterally or at times in combination to share the adventure of meeting the demands of the society. For this purpose, he would set aside some risk funds, i.e., 5 percent, of his budget for innovation, demonstration, and experimentation to test and evaluate existing procedures and try out new ones.

In my judgment, there are now more forces favoring the kind of trend I am suggesting than many of us realize. In our favor there is first of all a growing recognition of the increasingly important role of higher education and especially the university in our society.

On all sides there is evidence of this fact. Universities are, for the most part, the centers where new knowledge is being produced and where the talent for producing new knowledge is located. They are also and obviously the source from which the emerging leadership of the society is recruited. Moreover, their facilities contain much if not most of the expertise from which both the public and private sectors draw their advice on planning and programming. Their role as critic and conscience of the society is becoming more and more respected. Finally, as centers for training of personnel for the entire apparatus of elementary, secondary, higher and professional education, they are literally the educational headwaters of the society.

So far, I have been speaking of the growing influence of the institutions of higher learning as a whole. Let us attempt to forecast the direction which the institutional response to the demands for adult education will take.

First, let us assume that these demands are legitimate and can no longer be ignored. It is my prediction that the extension service or its equivalent will be the arm of the university through which this response will be made. I believe that the cooperation and contribution of the disciplines will always be important, indeed, indispensible. But in my judgment the organization and dynamics of the disciplines do not permit the development of the kind of program necessary to make the response which will be needed. The needs of the society are crossed or interdisciplinary in character and their unit of manifestation is usually a problem. As we all know, problem areas have always been difficult for higher education to institutionalize. Institutes and centers for area studies are examples of new administrative attempts to deal with new forms of academic inquiry. But even these are not problem centered in the manner which society expresses. Again, the kind of response I envisage will require skills of procedure, method and programming uniquely adapted to the adult client. Again, these are elements largely foreign to the interest, skills and competencies of disciplines, departments, centers and institutes. The character of the societal demand on the one hand, and the administrative traditions and habits of the universities on the other, point to the extension service as a logical vehicle through which an appropriate response will be effected.

In conclusion, there is another factor which I predict will effect the response in this field. I believe that the problems and needs we are discussing are so urgent, massive and common, that institutions of higher learning will be compelled more and more to pool their resources in a collaborative effort to meet them. In other words, I believe some application of systems theory to a regional linkage of higher education in the domain of adult education is not only feasible but necessary. I think the time will come and come soon, when we will regard the institutions of higher learning as regional centers for community and educational improvement. Because of the nearness of extension divisions to the market, they would be the logical arm by which a systematic approach to the education of adults would be achieved.

I make no prediction as to the timing and schedule of this development, but I believe it will come and that we already have evidence that it is on its way. At any rate, the need is there. Higher education has part of the answer and it will be compelled to make its share of the response.

STAFF OF THE INSTITUTE

Alton P. Hadlock, Director

Charles F. Caskey, Associate Director

Shizuko N. Harry, Department of Education
University of Utah

Jo Anne K. Musser, Secretary

Ginger M. Walmsley, Secretary

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Robert Altman	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Robert D. Boyd	Commission of Professors of Adult Education
Bayard Clark	U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Brent H. Gubler	Utah State Board of Education
Harry Hilton	Regional Program Officer, U. S. Office of Education
Glen Jensen	Commission of Professors of Adult Education
Willard Lane	University Council for Educational Administration
James E. Lightbody	Representing the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education
Roy B. Minnis	Regional Adult Education Program Officer, U. S. Office of Education
Calvin Nichols	Regional Adult Education Program Officer, U. S. Office of Education
Carwin Y. Peterson	Utah System of Higher Education
Avard Rigby	Utah State Board of Education
Everett Samuelson	Association of Deans of Colleges of Education

PARTICIPANTS

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR'S INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING IN ADULT EDUCATION

NAME	INSTITUTION
Bill J. Brisco Associate Professor of Educational Administration	University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721
M. M. Gubser Assistant to the Dean	University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721
Harry F. Hodge Dean, College of Education	Arkansas State University State University, Arkansas 72467
Ben A. Lewis Dean, Graduate School	State College of Arkansas Conway, Arkansas 72032
Leon Levitt Assistant Prof. of Teacher Education	University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007
Denzil Clegg Assoc. Prof. of Cont. Educ. Department of Education	Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Paul Kaus Coordinator, Continuing Educ.	University of Idaho Moscow, Idaho 83843
Everett V. Samuelson Dean, College of Education	University of Idaho Moscow, Idaho 83843
Richard Lee Willey Dean, College of Education	Idaho State University Pocatello, Idaho 83201
Arthur Burman Professor of Education College of Education	University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Samuel Robert Keys Dean, College of Education	Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66502

NAME	INSTITUTION
J. T. Sandefur Dean, School of Education and Psychology	Kansas State Teachers College Emporia, Kansas 66801
W. Eugene Werner Head, Department of Educational Administration	Kansas State Teachers College Emporia, Kansas 66801
William E. Gardner Associate Dean, College of Education	University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Bob G. Woods Dean, College of Education	University of Missouri-Columbia Columbia, Missouri 65201
Arvin C. Blome Assistant Dean College of Education	Montana State University Bozeman, Montana 59715
James B. Case Chairman, Secondary Education	University of Nevada at Las Vegas Las Vegas, Nevada 89109
Richard L. Holemon Associate Dean Curriculum and Instruction	University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106
Gene M. Wright Assistant Prof., Educational Foundations and ABE Specialist Cont. Ed. and Ext. Div.	University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106
O. E. Lovell Dean, Graduate School	Nicholls State University Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301
Allan W. Sturges Professor and Chairman Department of Education	University of North Dakota Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201
Edgar L. Petty Chairman, Div. of Ed. and Psychology	Central State College Edmond, Oklahoma 73034
Eugene F. Cates Associate Dean College of Education	University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma 73069

NAME	INSTITUTION
Loren M. Carlson Director of State-Wide Ed. Services	University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota 57069
V. Duane Everrett Head, Department of Education	South Dakota State University Brookings, South Dakota 57006
Thomas Edward Moriarty Dean, School of Education	University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota 57069
Oscar Lee Dorsey Dean of the College of Professional Schools	Southwest Texas State University San Marcos, Texas 78666
Earl Jones Director, Adult Education	Texas A & M University College Station, Texas 77843
Earl W. Harmer Chairman, Department of Education	University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Jack H. Cooper Professor of Higher Education	Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99163
Lloyd B. Urdal Chairman and Professor Department of Education	Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99163
Laurence A. Walker Acting Dean College of Education	University of Wyoming Laramie, Wyoming 82070

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, and WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A. L. Hardwick, Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Adult Vocational and Technical Education
USOE - HEW
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Paul Delker, Director
Division of Adult Education Programs
USOE - HEW
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Gene Sullivan
Division of Adult Education
USOE - HEW
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Jean Hinsley
Division of Adult Education
USOE - HEW
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, and WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
REGIONAL PROGRAM OFFICERS

REGION VI

George Blassingame, Regional Program Officer
Adult Education
USOE - HEW
1114 Commerce Street
Dallas, Texas 75222

REGION VII

Harry Hilton, Regional Program Officer
Adult Education
USOE - HEW
601 East 12th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

REGION VIII

Roy Minnis, Regional Program Officer
Adult Education
USOE - HEW
Room 9017 - Federal Office Building
19th and Stout Streets
Denver, Colorado 80202

REGION IX

Calvin Nichols, Regional Program Officer
Adult Education
USOE - HEW
760 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94102

STATE DIRECTORS OF ADULT EDUCATION

ARIZONA

James Showers, Director
Adult Education
State Department of Public Instruction
1626 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85015
Tel: (602) 271-5281

ARKANSAS

Luther Black, Director
Adult Basic Education
State Department of Education
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
Tel: (501) 371-2263

CALIFORNIA

E. M. DeGabriele, Acting Chief
Bureau of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California 95814
Tel: (916) 445-5646

COLORADO

Joseph M. Connors, Consultant
Adult Basic Education
Colorado Department of Education
Room 420, State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203
Tel: (303) 892-2214

IDAHO

Marvin E. Rose, Consultant
Adult Basic Education
State Department of Education
Room 206, Statehouse
Boise, Idaho 83707
Tel: (208) 384-3384

State Directors of Adult Education (Continued)

IOWA

C. J. Johnston, Chief, Adult Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Grimes Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Tel: (515) 281-5251

KANSAS

W. W. Lee, Director
Adult Education Program
State Department of Public Instruction
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612
Tel: (913) 296-3191 Ext. 8183

LOUISIANA

E. L. Hammett, Director
Adult Education
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
Tel: (504) 389-6658

MINNESOTA

E. A. Mueller, Director
Adult Education
State Department of Education
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Tel: (612) 221-2126

MISSOURI

Bill Ghan, Director, Adult Education
State Department of Education
721 Jefferson Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
Tel: (314) 635-8125

MONTANA

Alvie Thomas
State Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Helena, Montana 59601

State Directors of Adult Education (Continued)

NEBRASKA

L. R. Hill
Administrative Director
Adult Education
State Department of Education
State Capitol Building - 12th floor
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
Tel: (402) 477-5211 Ext. 556

NEVADA

John W. Bunten, Director
Vocational Technical & Adult Branch
State Department of Education
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Tel: (702) 882-7321

NEW MEXICO

T. M. Trujillo, Director
Basic Adult Education
State Department of Education
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
Tel: (505) 827-2427

NORTH DAKOTA

J. I. Pennington, State Director
Adult Basic Education
General Extension Division
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201
Tel: (701) 777-2661

OKLAHOMA

Ed Olvey, Director
Section of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
Tel: (405) 521-3313

State Directors of Adult Education (Continued)

OREGON

Clifford Norris, Supervisor
Adult and Continuing Education
State Department of Education
Salem, Oregon 97310
Tel: (503) 378-3590

SOUTH DAKOTA

G. W. DeBow, Director
Adult Basic Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
Tel: (605) 224-3446

TEXAS

Ralph Mock, Director
Adult and Continuing Education
Texas Education Agency
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711
Tel: (512) 475-3891

UTAH

A. A. Rigby, Administrator
Division of Special Educational Services
State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Tel: (801) 328-5431

Dr. B. H. Gubler, Coordinator
Adult Education
State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Tel: (801) 328-5574

WASHINGTON

E. E. Clausen, Director
Adult Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Olympia, Washington 98501
Tel: (206) 753-6748

State Directors of Adult Education (Continued)

WYOMING

R. W. Rowles, Director
Adult Basic Education, and
Administrator of G. E. D.
State Department of Education
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
Tel: (307) 777-7380

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAY 11 1972
on Adult Education